This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Per 1419 e . 402

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

trust, may be supposed to give at least a general sanction to the teaching of the Principal of the Theological College which he has founded.

In this volume the two doctrines of Prayers for the Departed and of Invocation of Saints are tried by the Vincentian canon of truth, 'Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est;' and it seems to us that Dr. Luckock is completely successful in proving that, when tried by this test, the former must stand and the latter must fall. Into the question of Invocation of Saints we do not propose to enter; but with regard to the former subject a mass of evidence is here brought forward (1) from Jewish writings, (2) from the Catacombs, (3) from the Liturgies, and (4) from the Early Fathers, to show the antiquity and universality of the practice. For this we refer our readers to Dr. Luckock's pages, and pass on to the questions noted above. On the first of these—What is the doctrine implied by the practice?—Dr. Luckock's views are clearly and decidedly expressed; and we heartily go along with him in the conclusion at which he arrives, viz. 'that the soul is capable of change after its separation from the body by death:'[1] a view which, as is rightly pointed out, is quite distinct from the doctrine of Purgatory as taught by the Roman Church.

'The Liturgies and the Fathers appealed to here deal with the dead who come within the range of our prayers, as being in a condition of peace and rest, of light and refreshment; whereas the Roman doctrine maintains that the faithful dead, as well as the sinful, are in a state of penal torment.'[2]

And in support of this distinction a passage is quoted from the writings of the Lutheran Bishop Martensen:—

'Since no soul leaves this state of being in a fully concluded and finished condition, the middle state must be considered as a realm of continued development, wherein souls may be prepared, and ripen for the Last Judgment. Although the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory is rejected, because it is mixed up with so much that is harsh and false, it contains nevertheless the truth that the intermediate state, in a purely spiritual sense, must be a purgatory determined for the purifying of the soul.'

That there exists some such distinction as that here drawn was confessed by the English Church so early as the year 1536. Of the 'Ten Articles about religion set out by the Convocation and published by the king's authority' in this year, the last treats of the subject of Purgatory. Prayers

[1] *After Death*, p. 52. [2] *Ib.* p. 126.

Digitized by Google

for the departed are of course retained, and (it is true) a Purgatory of *pain* for the faithful is taught; but the Article proceeds as follows:—

'Forasmuch as the place where they be, the name thereof, and kind of pains there also, be to us uncertain by Scripture; therefore this, with all other things, we remit to God Almighty, unto whose mercy it is meet and convenient for us to commend them, trusting that God accepteth our prayers for them, referring the rest wholly to God, to Whom is known their estate and condition; wherefore it is much necessary that such abuses be clearly put away which under the name of Purgatory hath been advanced, as to make men believe that through the Bishop of Rome's pardon souls might clearly be delivered out of Purgatory, and all the pains of it, or that masses said at Scala Cœli or otherwhere, in any place, or before any image, might likewise deliver them from all their pain, and send them to heaven, and other like abuses.'[1]

These words are important, as showing very clearly the kind of teaching condemned in Article XXII. as the 'Romish doctrine of Purgatory;' for it is well known that that Article cannot have been aimed against the Tridentine decree on this subject—a decree which simply states the bare fact that 'there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but chiefly by the sacrifice of the Altar;' and then proceeds to correct abuses connected with the doctrine—for the simple reason that the decree was not in existence when the Article was drawn up.[2]

The word Purgatory, it is true, has an ugly sound to Anglican ears, and is objectionable inasmuch as it seems to carry with it the whole Roman doctrine of a Purgatory of pain, and all the practical abuses and superstitions connected with it; but substitute for this word the expression 'process of purification' and the objections seem to fall to the ground. We no longer bring in from without a meaning derived, not from the expression, but from preconceived ideas, education, tradition, and perhaps prejudice; and the words simply stand for what they are really worth, and imply nothing more than this: that somehow or other (*how* we do not pretend to say) stains of past sin may be gradually removed after death. To take only one illustration. Every parish priest must have mourned over hundreds of cases where men have passed away from this world whose sanctification was terribly imperfect. And yet their faces were towards the light, and their trust in the Redeemer's merits was sure, though stains of sin contracted

[1] See *Formularies of Faith*, p. 17.
[2] See Bishop Forbes on the XXXIX. Articles, p. 302 *sq.*

Digitized by Google

in past years had been so deeply engrained in their nature that they could only be gradually and slowly eradicated, and then death came upon them while the work was very, very far from complete. And what are we to say of such? Were all those stains, so gradually acquired, so deeply engrained, so slowly and painfully effaced during their lifetime, suddenly and completely removed at an instant, in the great shock through which the soul passed at the moment of death? Is there anything in Holy Scripture to lead us to such a view? Is it not contrary to all analogy that it should be so? Is it not far more probable, far more reverent, far more natural, and therefore far more Scriptural, to believe that those stains shall be removed (as they were gained) slowly and by degrees, the soul being gradually purified and made whiter and whiter in preparation for the final Judgment Day?

With regard to our second question—'Does the doctrine of prayer for the departed obtain any support from the Scripture?—there is not much to be said. The stock passages *for* and *against* are quoted and examined by Dr. Luckock;[1] and the conclusion at which we arrive is that, while there is nothing that can be fairly urged *against*, there is perhaps more than is commonly supposed in *favour* of, the practice; and we are glad to notice that the true bearing of our Lord's silence on this subject is carefully pointed out.[2] If, as all the evidence seems to show, prayers for the departed have always held their place in the service of the Jewish Synagogues, then it seems incredible that our Lord should have left no word in condemnation of the practice, were it (as is so often alleged) futile and superstitious. For ourselves, we are inclined to claim for it even a higher antiquity than Dr. Luckock would assign to it, and to see the earliest known instance of it in the language of Psalm cxxxii.: 'LORD, remember David and all his afflictions' is *not* an adequate rendering of the Hebrew text, זְכוֹר־יְהוָה לְדָוִד אֵת כָּל־עֻנּוֹתוֹ, which would be more fairly rendered, 'LORD, remember to David all his anxious cares.' Now it should be noticed (1) that the expression 'remember to' a person is a regular Hebrew idiom for remembering with a view to requiting good or evil; (2) that the suffix following in עֻנּוֹתוֹ forces us to take דָּוִד in a *personal* sense; and (3) that all modern critics assign to the Psalm an origin later than the days of David.[3] If, therefore, they are right in this, it would

[1] *After Death*, chap. vi. [2] *Ib.* chap. v.

[3] The exact date of the Psalm is a matter of uncertainty. By some critics it is assigned to Solomon; but by the majority a post-exilic date is maintained.

Digitized by Google

seem that we have in this verse an instance of the practice of praying for the departed some centuries before the Christian era, and prior even to the oft-quoted mention of it in the Second Book of Maccabees.

We pass on now to the third of our questions, 'Has the Church of England expressed her mind upon the subject in her authoritative documents?' This is but slightly touched upon by Dr. Luckock in a supplementary chapter;[1] and, as we have nowhere seen a complete and satisfactory treatment of the subject, we propose to dwell upon it at somewhat greater length. In endeavouring to answer this question, the ground we have to examine is considerably narrowed. We have to consider the successive editions of the Prayer-Book, the Articles, and the Homilies; and the opinions of private persons will be quoted only when they seem to throw light on the meaning of these.

Starting, then, with the change of doctrine in the reign of Edward VI., we turn to the first English Prayer-Book then published, that of 1549. Everybody knows that in this book the ancient practice of commemorating and praying for the departed in the great Intercession at the Eucharist was continued; but the passage shall be given in full for the sake of completeness:—

'And here do we give unto Thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy Saints, from the beginning of the world: And chiefly in the glorious and most Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and steadfastness in Thy faith, and keeping Thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto Thy mercy (O Lord) all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son may altogether be set on His right hand and hear that His most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world: grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.'

The Burial Service also included these three prayers with reference to the departed, besides a commendation of the soul to God when the earth was cast upon the corpse:—

'We commend into Thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father,

[1] *After Death*, p. 236 *sq.*

Digitized by Google

the soul of this our brother departed, *N.* And his body we commit to the earth, beseeching Thine infinite goodness to give us grace to live in Thy fear and love, and to die in Thy favour: that when the judgment shall come which Thou hast committed to Thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother, and we, may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and receive that blessing which Thy well-beloved Son shall then pronounce to all that love and fear Thee, saying, Come, ye blessed children of My Father: Receive the kingdom prepared for you before the beginning of the world. Grant this, merciful Father, for the honour of Jesu Christ our only Saviour, Mediator, and Advocate.'

'Almighty God, we give Thee hearty thanks for this Thy servant, whom Thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wretched world, from the body of death and all temptation: and, as we trust, hast brought his soul, which he committed into Thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest: Grant, we beseech Thee, that at the day of judgment his soul and all the souls of Thy elect, departed out of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive Thy promises, and be made perfit [*sic*] altogether, thorough the glorious resurrection of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.'

'O Lord, with Whom do live the spirits of them that be dead: and in Whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burden of the flesh, be in joy and felicity: Grant unto this Thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible: set him on the right hand of Thy Son Jesus Christ, among Thy holy and elect, that then he may hear with them these most sweet and comfortable words: Come to Me, ye blessed of My Father, possess the kingdom which hath been prepared for you from the beginning of the world: Grant this, we beseech Thee, O merciful Father, through Jesus Christ our Mediator and Redeemer.'

Further, provision was made for a 'celebration of the Holy Communion when there is a Burial of the Dead,' and the Collect for that service was the following:—

'O Merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesu Christ, Who is the Resurrection and the Life: In Whom whosoever believeth shall live, though he die: and whosoever liveth, and believeth in Him, shall not die eternally: Who also hath taught us (by his holy Apostle Paul) not to be sorry as men without hope for them that sleep in Him: We meekly beseech Thee (O Father) to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness, that when we shall depart this life, we may sleep in Him (as our hope is this our brother doth),

Digitized by Google

and at the general resurrection in the last day both we and this our brother departed, receiving again our bodies, and rising again in Thy most gracious favour, may with all Thine elect Saints obtain eternal joy. Grant this, O Lord God, by the means of our Advocate Jesus Christ: Which with Thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth One God for ever.'

All this is well known, and it is equally well known that, in 1552, a revised book was published, with a large number of alterations, many of them being due to the suggestions of foreigners, whose interference was so prejudicial to the course of the English Reformation. The particular doctrine of prayer for the dead was singled out by both Calvin and Bucer for animadversion, and accordingly all mention of the departed was struck out from the Communion Service, the Intercession being separated from the Consecration prayer, and being prefaced by the words, 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church *militant here in earth*,' and ending with the prayer for all in trouble, which in our present book stands immediately before the commemoration of the departed restored at the last revision. In the Burial Service all mention of a celebration of the Holy Communion was omitted, and the prayers given above were altered and fused together with large omissions, so that the result was the formation of the two following prayers:—

'Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and in Whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burden of the flesh, be in joy and felicity: We give Thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this *N.* our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world: beseeching Thee, that it may please Thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect and to haste Thy kingdom, that we with this our brother, and all other departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory.'

'O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the Resurrection and the Life, in Whom whosoever believeth shall live, though he die; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Him, shall not die eternally: Who also taught us (by his holy Apostle Paul) not to be sorry, as men without hope, for them that sleep in Him: We meekly beseech Thee (O Father) to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness, that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in Him, as our hope is this our brother doth; and that at the general resurrection in the last day, we may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and receive that blessing which Thy well-beloved Son shall then pronounce to all that love and fear Thee,

Digitized by Google

saying: Come ye blessed children of My Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world. Grant this, we beseech Thee, O merciful Father, through Jesus Christ our Mediator and Redeemer.'

Now what is to be said about these alterations and omissions? Do they amount to a *condemnation* of the doctrine in question? We think not. For it should always be remembered that the Act of Parliament which sanctioned the Second Prayer-Book declared that the Book of 1549 had contained nothing 'but what was agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church,' and that such doubts as had been raised in the use and exercise thereof proceeded rather from 'the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause.'[1] But further, did the alterations even amount to an *omission* or *discontinuance* of the practice? Of course, it *was* entirely discontinued in the Communion Service: but it will be seen that by the open grave the voice of nature refused to be silenced, and one clause was spared to be a relief and consolation to pious hearts, and words were left in which the prayer went up 'that we with this our brother, and all other departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul:' words which are a distinct prayer for the dead, and which were understood as such by the Puritans mentioned by Bishop Cosin in a well-known passage: 'The Puritans think that here is prayer for the dead allowed and practised by the Church of England, and so think I; but we are not both of one mind in censuring the Church for so doing. They say it is Popish and superstitious; I, for my part, esteem it pious and Christian.'[2] Similarly Bishop Sparrow, in his *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer* (published in 1657), understands the whole passage as 'a thanksgiving for that our brother's safe delivery out of misery; and lastly, a prayer for his and our consummation in glory, and joyful absolution at the last day.'[3] It is strange, however, that at the Savoy Conference the Puritans objected to the passage, not on the ground that it contained a prayer for the dead, but because the words 'might harden the wicked and were inconsistent with the largest rational charity.'[4] But they seem to have had an uneasy feeling that the passage

[1] Cf. Procter on *Common Prayer*, p. 35.

[2] Quoted as from Bishop Overall by Wheatly on *Common Prayer*, p. 320; but see Cosin's *Works*, vol. v. pp. xiv., xv. *A. C. Lib.*

[3] Sparrow, *Rationale*, p. 283.

[4] Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 333.

Digitized by Google

did contain an objectionable prayer, for their first suggestion with regard to the Burial Service was this: 'We desire that it may be expressed in a rubrick, that the prayers and exhortations here used are not for the benefit of the dead, but only for the instruction and comfort of the living:'[1] a desire which the Bishops in their answer passed over in silence.

To return to the reign of Edward VI. The year in which the second Prayer-Book was published saw the preparation of the famous XLII. Articles (the forerunners of the still more famous XXXIX.), which were published in the following spring. These, it is well known, are dumb on the subject of prayer for the departed. All mention of such a thing is omitted. Now there are certain persons who are fond of telling us that in authoritative documents 'omission is prohibition.' Let us suppose for an instant that this rule holds good here; it will still be a question whether the *practice* or the *condemnation* of it is prohibited. The Articles are equally silent about both; and they are not, be it remembered, only a series of affirmative propositions stating what the Church of England *does* hold. Many of them are cast in a negative form, declaring with tolerable clearness what the Church of England does *not* believe. 'The Old Testament is *not* contrary to the New.' 'Original sin standeth *not* in the following of Adam.' 'The riches and goods of Christians are *not* common,' &c. &c. And there is one Article in which we should certainly look for a mention of the doctrine if it were to be condemned, viz. Article xxiii. of 1553 (xxii. of our present series): 'The doctrine of school-authors concerning Purgatory, Pardons, worshipping, and adoration as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly feigned, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.' Here are several doctrines, some of which are closely connected in the popular mind with prayer for the dead, condemned with sufficient clearness: but of a condemnation of the doctrine itself there is not a hint. And this silence is the more remarkable when we discover that in the original draft there was a clause including prayers for the dead among the doctrines condemned, and that it disappeared before the Articles were promulgated. To make this clear we must refer for a moment to the history of the Articles. They were originally framed by Cranmer himself, and then submitted by him to the other English Bishops in 1551. The book remained with them till the

[1] Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 332.

Digitized by Google

spring of 1552, when, in obedience to an order bearing date May 2, it was laid before the Council; then returned to the Archbishop, revised by him, and passed on in September to Sir W. Cecil and Sir J. Cheke, after which it was submitted to the King. In the following month the book was laid before the six royal chaplains, who were directed to 'consider certaine Articles exhibited to the Kinges Ma^tie^, to be subscribed by all suche as shal be admitted to be preachers or ministers in any part of the realme, and to make report of theyr opinions touching the same.' The book was considered and *subscribed* by them, and remitted once more to the Archbishop (November 20) for 'the last corrections of his judgment and his pen.' On November 24 a copy was sent back to the Royal Council, and henceforth we hear nothing of the Articles till their publication in May, 1553, with the title, 'Articles agreed on by the Bishops and other learned men in the Synod at London, in the year of our Lord 1552, for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion.'[1] Convocation had been summoned for March 19, 155$\frac{2}{3}$, and dissolved on April 1, and the Articles were probably agreed to therein, though the shortness of time cannot have admitted of much discussion, nor will it allow us to suppose that the Articles then received any substantial alterations.[2] But the point to which we are anxious to direct attention is this: that the Latin MS. signed by the six royal chaplains is still in existence, and that in it is included a condemnation of the doctrine of the school-authors 'de precatione pro defunctis.'[3] This clause has entirely disappeared before the publication of the Articles by Wolfe in May 1553, and it is hard to resist the conclusion that it was struck out by the Archbishop himself, when the Articles were remitted to him for the 'last corrections of his judgment and his pen.' But whoever was the author of the change the fact remains the same, that the omission of the condemnation of prayers for the dead was deliberate and designed. And therefore, if it be true that omission is prohibition, those are condemned who assert, as too many assert nowadays, that the doctrine of prayer for the dead is a 'fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God,' and not those who, in reliance on Catholic tradition

[1] Cf. Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, pp. 74–77.
[2] Cf. Joyce's *Sacred Synods*, p. 482.
[3] Cf. Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, p. 304; and cf. Lemon's *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1547–1580, p. 46.

Digitized by Google

and practice, and in obedience to a voice within that will not be silenced, continue to ask that God will grant to their departed friends a place of light and refreshment, and at the last a joyful resurrection.

Passing over the reactionary reign of Mary, we come to that of Elizabeth. At the restoration of the English Prayer-Book in 1559, no change whatever was made from the Second Book of Edward VI. in those passages which concern prayer for the dead; *i.e.* there was still no commemoration of the departed in the Eucharistic service, but there *was* the clause in the Burial Service containing the prayer 'that we with this our brother and all other departed in the true faith of Thy holy name may have our perfect consummation and bliss,' &c. But in the same year there was published a remarkable volume, which has scarcely received the attention it merits. It is entitled 'The Primer set furth at large, with many godly and devoute prayers. Anno 1559,' and is in substance a revised edition of King Henry's *Primer* of 1545, which had already been twice reprinted in Edward's reign, in 1551 and 1552. Among other forms of prayer this book contains services for the seven Canonical Hours, and at the end of Lauds, among a number of Collects, we find this:—

'Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the living God, set Thy holy Passion, Cross, and Death, between Thy judgment and our souls, both now and at the hour of death. And moreover vouchsafe to grant unto the living mercy and grace, to the dead pardon and rest, to Thy holy Church peace and concord, and to us wretched sinners life and joy everlasting: which livest and reignest God with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen. The glorious Passion of our Lord Jesu Christ deliver us from sorrowful heaviness, and bring us to the joys of Paradise. Amen.'[1]

Later on in the same book we find a revised English edition of the 'Dirige,' ending with the three following prayers:—

'O God, Which by the mouth of S. Paul, Thine Apostle, hast taught us not to wail for them that sleep in Christ, grant, we beseech Thee, that in the coming of Thy Son, our Lord Jesu Christ, both we, and all other faithful people being departed, may be graciously brought unto the joys everlasting, Which shalt come to judge the quick and dead, and the world by fire. Amen.'

'Almighty, eternal God, to whom there is never any prayer made without hope of mercy, be merciful to the souls of Thy servants, being departed from this world in the confession of Thy name, that

[1] This prayer is found also in Mr. Maskell's *Primer*, printed in the *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. ii.

Digitized by Google

they may be associate to the company of Thy Saints. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.'

'Lord, bow Thine ears unto our prayers, wherein we devoutly call upon Thy name mercy,[1] that Thou wilt bestow the souls of Thy servants, which Thou hast commanded to depart from this world, in the country of peace and rest, and cause them to be made partners with Thy holy servants. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.'[2]

In the course of Elizabeth's reign there were several other editions of *Primers* put forth, more or less similar to that of 1559, most of them, it is true, *without* prayer for the dead: but the three prayers given above at the end of the 'Dirige' are found in one other edition, of which the date cannot be ascertained. Only one copy of this seems to be known, and in that 'the title-page is gone, nor is there anything throughout the book to supply the deficiency.'[3] It is, however, different in many respects from the book of 1559, and therefore the fact is clearly established that in *two* editions of the *Primer* put forth in Elizabeth's reign, prayers for the dead were deliberately retained.

In the year 1560, we find a still more remarkable volume published, namely, a Latin edition of the Prayer-Book, authorized by letters patent, dated April 6, 'upon the petition of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and the two Colleges of Winchester and Eaton, that for the further improvement of their members they might use the same form of public prayer in Latin.'[4] The words of the letters patent are worth quoting:—

'Constituimus per præsentes licitum esse et permissum nostra auctoritate et privilegio regali tam Decano et Sodalitio Ecclesiæ Christi in Academia nostra Oxoniæ, quam præsidibus, custodibus, rectoribus, magistris et sodalitatibus, omnium et singulorum Collegiorum Cantabrigiæ, Oxoniæ, Wintoniæ, et Etoniæ hoc modo precandi Latine uti publice in Ecclesiis et Sacellis suis, quem nos per nostrum Typographum edi curavimus in hoc præsenti volumine, convenientem cum Anglicano nostro Publicarum Precum libro, jam per universum nostrum regnum recepto et usitato. Cui item peculiaria quædam in Christianorum funebribus et exequiis decantanda adjungi præcepimus, statuto illo prædicto de ritu publicarum precum (cujus supra mentionem fecimus) anno primo regni nostri promulgato in contrarium

[1] 'Name' seems to be redundant; probably it is a typographical error. 1545, 'Thy mercy.' The Latin, 'Misericordiam.' Note in Elizabeth's *Private Prayers*, p. 67.

[2] The *Primer* from which these prayers are taken is printed in the *Private Prayers*, put forth by authority during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. Parker Society, pp. 1–114.

[3] *Private Prayers*, p. x.

[4] Strype, *Annals*, vol. i. p. 333.

Digitized by Google

non obstante. . . . Eadem etiam formula Latina precandi privatim uti hortamur omnes reliquos Ecclesiæ nostræ Anglicanæ ministros, cujuscunque gradus fuerint, iis diebus, quibus aut non solent, aut non tenentur, parochianis suis, ad ædem sacram pro more accedentibus, publice preces vernacula lingua secundum formam dicti Statuti recitare.'[1]

Thus we see that in spite of the Act of Uniformity, or rather in accordance with the power expressly reserved to the Sovereign by that Act,[2] additional forms were provided by the Royal authority, and their use not only allowed in the Universities and the Colleges of Eton and Winchester, but also recommended to all the clergy in their private devotions. It is with the additional forms at the end of the book that we are here concerned: they are prefaced by a quotation from S. Augustine's work *De Civitate Dei* (bk. i. c. xii.): 'Curatio funeris, conditio sepulturæ, pompa exequiarum, magis sunt vivorum solatia, quam subsidia mortuorum' (a passage that has always seemed to us the best justification of the wide departure of our present Burial Service from the mediæval use); and then follows (1) a service to be used 'in commendationibus benefactorum' ending with this prayer:—

'Domine Deus, resurrectio et vita credentium, Qui semper es laudandus tam in viventibus, quam in defunctis, agimus tibi gratias pro fundatore nostro *N.* ceterisque benefactoribus nostris, quorum beneficiis hic ad pietatem et studia literarum alimur; rogantes, ut nos, his donis ad tuam gloriam recte utentes, una cum illis ad resurrectionis gloriam immortalem perducamur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.'

(2.) 'Celebratio cœnæ Domini in funebribus, si amici et vicini defuncti communicare velint.'

The forms are literally translated from the service used on a like occasion, in the English book of 1549, and therefore contain this clause in the Collect:—

'Humiliter petimus ut . . . in generali resurrectione extremo die nos una cum hoc fratre nostro resuscitati et receptis corporibus regnemus una tecum in vita æterna.'

Considering who were the leaders of opinion at Cambridge

[1] The full forms of the letters patent may be found in Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 280; in Sparrow's *Collection*, p. 201; and in the *Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth*, Parker Society, p. 301.

[2] It has lately been pointed out by Mr. Parker that the appointment of this Latin service was strictly a taking 'further order in rites and ceremonies' expressly allowed to the Sovereign by the Act of Uniformity. See the *Letter to Lord Selborne*, p. 11, and cf. Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 297.

Digitized by Google

throughout Elizabeth's reign, and remembering that this Latin Prayer-Book provided for reservation of the consecrated elements for the Communion of the sick, we can hardly feel much surprise at hearing that the book was not generally received with much favour in that University. Archbishop Parker, it would seem, did his best to procure the use of the Latin prayers, but most colleges 'would have none of them.' He succeeded, however, in persuading 'the master of Gonvil Hall, and him of Corpus Christi College,' to regard the Queen's authority, to the great disgust of some members of the latter college, 'insomuch that some of the fellowship of Bene't College went contemptuously from the Latin prayers, the master being the minister then that read the same. And some of them said that *Latin service was the Popes dreggs*.'[1]

We now come to the Convocation of 1563, which accepted and authorized the XXXIX Articles, and among them of course the XXXVth of *Homilies*. 'The second book of *Homilies* . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times,' &c.

We turn therefore to the *Homilies* to see what is their teaching on the subject of prayer for the dead, and here we find the only instance in anything that has the slightest claim to be an authoritative document of words condemnatory of the practice. the passage is to be found in the third part of the *Homily of Prayer*, which is generally assigned to the pen of Bishop Jewel :—

'Now to entreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world or no. Wherein if we will cleave only unto the Word of God, then must we needs grant, that we have no commandment so to do. For the Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life, the one proper to the elect and blessed of God, the other to the reprobate and damned souls ; as may be well gathered by the parable of Lazarus and the rich man. Which place S. Augustine expounding saith on this wise : "That which Abraham speaketh unto the rich man in S. Luke's Gospel, namely, that the just cannot go into those places where the wicked are tormented, what other things doth it signify but only this, that the just, by reason of God's judgment, which may not be revoked, can show no deed of mercy in helping them which after this life are cast into prison *until they pay the uttermost farthing?*" These words, as they confound the opinion of helping the dead by prayer, so they do clean confute and take away the vain error of Purgatory, which is grounded upon this saying of the Gospel : *Thou shalt not depart thence, until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.* Now doth S. Augustine say, that those men which are cast into prison after this life on

[1] Strype's *Parker*, p. 535, anno 1568.

Digitized by Google

that condition may in no wise be holpen, though we would help them never so much. And why? Because the sentence of God is unchangeable, and cannot be revoked again. Therefore let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help other, or other may help us, by good and charitable prayers in time to come. For, as the preacher saith, *when the tree falleth, whether it be toward the south or toward the north, in what place soever the tree falleth, there it lieth;* meaning thereby, that every mortal man dieth either in the state of salvation or damnation, according as the words of the Evangelist John do also plainly import, saying, *He that believeth on the Son of God hath eternal life; but he that believeth not on the Son shall never see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him.* Where is then that third place, which they call Purgatory? or where shall our prayers help and profit the dead? S. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, Heaven and Hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture. Chrysostom likewise is of this mind, that, unless we wash away our sins in this present world, we shall find no comfort afterwards. And S. Cyprian saith, that after death "repentance and sorrow of pain shall be without fruit; weeping also shall be in vain, and prayer shall be to no purpose." Therefore he counselleth all men to make provision for themselves while they may, because, "When they are once departed out of this life, there is no place for repentance, nor yet for satisfaction." Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of Purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by all our prayers: but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption.'

Now it must strike everybody first, that the passages which Bishop Jewel here quotes against prayers for the dead are not particularly convincing;[1] and, secondly, that his teaching 'that the soul of man passing out of the body goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell' is hardly consistent with the teaching of the Church concerning the last judgment: and therefore it is no wonder that the whole passage has not succeeded in persuading men that the Church of England has definitely rejected the doctrine of prayer for the dead. Collier's arguments seem to be quite sufficient as against the passage quoted:—

'First. This Homily is principally levelled against the doctrine of Purgatory, maintained in the Church of Rome. And to make the most of this discourse, the arguments pretend to go no further than the insignificancy of such applications; the Homily does nowhere

[1] Cf. Jewel's *Controversy with Harding. Works*, vol. ii. p. 743. Parker Society.

Digitized by Google

assert them dangerous or unlawful. Secondly. The Church of England's affirming the Homilies contain a godly and wholesome doctrine falls short of touching every passage in this collection. The Homilies may be a good body of instruction as to the main; without being everywhere exact in the argument, and demonstrative throughout the whole book. And how happy this Homily concerning prayer has been in representing S. Cyprian, S. Chrysostom, and S. Augustine upon this subject, I shall leave the learned reader to consider.'[1]

Still more convincing are the words of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in his judgment in the case of 'Breeks *v.* Woolfrey,' delivered in the Arches Court of Canterbury on Nov. 19, 1838:—

'In looking to the Homilies it must be considered what was the purpose for which it was composed, viz. to discourage the practice of praying for the dead as connected with the doctrine of Purgatory; but in no part of the Homilies is it declared that the practice of praying for the dead is unlawful, merely that it is useless: that prayers for the dead could have no effect in altering the condition of the dead, and that in the Word of God we have no commandment to do so; and referring to S. Chrysostom and S. Cyprian, it is said, "Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of Purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers." It seemed clearly to have been the intention of the composer of the Homilies to discourage the practice of praying for the dead; but it does not appear that in any part of the Homilies he declares the practice to be an unlawful one. But supposing he had been of opinion that such prayers were unlawful, it is not to be necessarily inferred that the Church of England adopted every part of the doctrines contained in the Homilies. If it had been the opinion of the framers of the Articles and Canons of the Church that prayers for the dead were opposed to the Scriptures, they would have expressly declared their illegality. On this part of the case, then, I am of opinion that there has been no violation of any of the Articles of the Church. No other Articles have been referred to specifically to make out the proposition that the Church considered prayers for the dead an illegal practice.'[2]

We have only to add that the 'many divines' referred to in an earlier part of the judgment as believing that the Church of England has not prohibited prayers for the dead include among Bishops the names of Andrewes, Laud, Sparrow, Sanderson, Sheldon, Cosin, Jeremy Taylor, Wilson, Heber, &c., and of Hammond, Gunning, Thorndike, Wheatly, &c., in the second order of the ministry.[3]

[1] Collier's *Church History*, vol. v. p. 292.

[2] The judgment is given in full in Dr. F. G. Lee's *Christian Doctrine of Prayers for the Departed*, Appendix xii.

[3] Cf. Luckock, p. 245 *sq.*

Digitized by Google

The revision of the Prayer-Book that took place after the Hampton Court Conference left untouched those passages with which we are here concerned: but a few words must be said about the Canons put forth by the Convocation of 1603, 'published for the due observance of them, by His Majesty's authority, under the Great Seal of England.' The 55th Canon provides 'the form of a prayer to be used by all preachers before their sermons,' commonly known as the 'bidding prayer,' the last clause of which runs as follows:—

'Finally, let us praise God for all those which are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray unto God that we may have grace to direct our lives after their good example, that, this life ended, we may be made partakers with them of the glorious resurrection in the life everlasting.'

It is perhaps just possible, but it is by no means natural, to interpret this clause as including the departed in the prayer: considering the order of the words, it is better to take it as a prayer that we may share in that resurrection, which is assured to the faithful departed. Still the words are so far a return to primitive practice in that they are at least a recognition of the Communion of Saints, and a commemoration of those whose warfare is accomplished, even if they fall short of expressing the belief that the departed have still an interest in our petitions to the Throne of Grace.

There remain for consideration the alterations made in the Prayer-Book at the last revision, *viz.* that after the Savoy Conference, and thanks to the invaluable volumes published by Mr. Parker,[1] all students have now easy access to copies of all the documents which are of any importance for the history of this revision.

We find then that in the Upper House of Convocation, on November 21, 1661, the King's letters were read for a review of the book of Common Prayer, and a Committee of Revision appointed, consisting of Cosin, Bishop of Durham; Wren, of Ely; Skinner, of Oxford; Warner, of Rochester; Henchman, of Salisbury; Morley, of Worcester; Sanderson, of Lincoln; and Nicholson, of Gloucester; to meet at the Palace of the Lord Bishop of Ely (Wren), at five o'clock P.M. each day, except Sundays, until the said work was finished. With such speed was the work performed that the book was actually revised by the Committee, and submitted to Convocation

[1] *Introduction to the Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer; The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., compared with the successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer.*

Digitized by Google

within a month, and on December 20, 1661, was signed by both Houses of Convocation. The course of proceedings was this. Cosin, as is well known, 'had for years previously devoted much time to the consideration of the principles on which the Prayer-Book was compiled. He had gradually collected a large mass of material relating to the subject in the shape of notes, some original, but the greater part compiled from various sources, which rendered him especially qualified to advise upon the difficulties which arose in the course of discussion.'[1] It would seem that a Prayer-Book in which these notes were collected was used by the Committee of Bishops that met at Ely House, Sancroft (then Cosin's chaplain) acting as secretary, and this book is entitled by Mr. Parker 'Cosin's Corrected Copy, 1640–61.' It therefore gives us *the alterations suggested to the Bishops.* The result of their deliberations on the proposed changes was entered by Sancroft in the book, and the whole of the corrections agreed to by them copied off fairly by him into a Prayer-Book of 1634. This book, which is still preserved in the Bodleian Library, is entitled by Mr. Parker 'Sancroft's Fair Copy, 1661,' and gives us *the alterations agreed to by the Committee of Bishops.*[2]

The work of the Committee was next submitted to the Convocation, and it would seem that this 'fair copy,' embodying the results of the labours of the Bishops, was read out, and the several clauses as agreed to copied (still by Sancroft) into a Prayer-Book of 1636, which is known as 'The Convocation Copy, 1661,' and which gives us *the alterations agreed to by Convocation.*

The whole of the revised book was now copied out in MS. by clerks and signed by Convocation on Dec. 20, 1661, and the MS. copy was laid before the King, and sent down by him to Parliament early in 1662. The House of Lords, it would appear, suggested some 'emendations or other alterations,'[3] but the Commons resolved, on April 16, not to admit debate upon the amendments made by Convocation, and therefore accepted the book exactly as it was laid before them, and finally the Act of Uniformity was passed, and received the Royal assent on May 19, 1662, the manuscript, signed by Convocation, being fastened to it, and therefore being generally

[1] Parker's *Introduction*, p. xcii.

[2] According to Lord Selborne (*Liturgical History, &c.* p. 48), this book gives us the whole result of the revision by the Upper House of Convocation; but cf. Mr. Parker's *Letters to Lord Selborne*, p. 109 *sq.*

[3] Parker's *Introduction*, p. cccxlii.

Digitized by Google

known as 'the annexed book.'[1] This book therefore gives us *the result of the whole revision*, and of it the 'sealed books' as corrected are supposed to be exact copies.

Bearing in mind so much of the history of the revision, and of the character of the various books still existing, we are now able to trace the history of the alterations introduced in the Prayer-Book. We are here concerned with only two passages; (1), the prayer for the Church in the Communion Service, and (2) the prayer in the Burial Service, to which allusion has been already made. This latter was naturally left by Cosin unaltered in his corrected copy; and we learn from Sancroft's fair copy that the prayer, as it had stood since 1552, was passed by the Committee of Bishops; but when it was laid before Convocation an alteration was made, and the clause was brought into its present form; *i.e.*, instead of the prayer 'that we with this our brother and all other departed,' &c., were substituted the words, 'that we with all those that are departed in the true faith,' &c. The effect (and probably the intention) of the alteration is easily seen. Whereas formerly the clause was a distinct prayer for the departed (for the Church never pronounces the *certainty* of the individual's final blessedness), it is now cast in such a form that it may be taken as a prayer for the departed as well as for the mourners, or it may be regarded as a prayer that the mourners may obtain that perfect consummation and bliss which is assured at the last day to all the faithful departed. Thus, as far as the Burial Service is concerned, it becomes a question for each man to decide for himself, whether or no he will include the faithful departed in his prayer. The Church puts into his mouth words capable of two different interpretations, and leaves him to choose which of them he will make his own.

Turning now to the Communion Service and the prayer for the Church, we find that Cosin suggested (1) the alteration of the title to the following form: 'Let us offer up our prayers and praises for the good estate of Christ's Catholick Church,' and (2) the addition of this paragraph at the close of the prayer:—

'And we also blesse Thy holy name for all those Thy servants, who having finished their course in faith doe now rest from their labors. And wee yield unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderfull grace and vertue declared in all Thy saints,

[1] This book, together with that known as 'The Convocation Copy,' was discovered in 1867 in the Victoria Tower. See Parker's *Introduction* p. ccccxxxiv.

Digitized by Google

who have bin the choise vessells of Thy grace and the lights of the world in their severall generations. Most humbly beseeching Thee, that wee may have grace to follow the example of their stedfastness in Thy faith and obedience to Thy holy Commandments, that at the day of the generall Resurrection, wee and all they, which are of the mystical Body of Thy Sonne, may be sett on His right hand, and heare that His most joyfull voice, "Come yee Blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Grant this, O Father,' &c.[1]

Both these suggestions were, as we learn from Sancroft's fair copy, accepted by the Committee of Bishops. They were then laid before Convocation, and the following words were substituted for the clause at the close of the prayer:—

'And wee also blesse Thy holy name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and feare; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them wee may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom.'

The clause thus worded was, it will be seen, widely different from that accepted by the Committee. The opening words, 'We also bless Thy holy name for all Thy servants,' were taken from it; but the expressions that follow seem to have been suggested by the bidding prayer in the 55th Canon given above. There is, however, one instructive change. Instead of praying 'that we may be made partakers *with them*,' &c., we now pray 'that *with them* we may be partakers,' &c. We can hardly suppose that this change in the order of the words was accidental; and there is a difference in the meaning of the two clauses, though one that is more easily felt than expressed. It would seem, however, to be this: that in the Canon there is no thought of including the faithful departed in the petition, while the amended order of the words does at least suggest such a thought, and makes it possible and not unnatural to take the passage as a prayer for the living and the dead.

[1] The paragraph is copied word for word from the unfortunate Prayer-Book prepared for the use of the Church of Scotland in 1637 (which was certainly revised by Laud and Wren, if not actually drawn up by them). It is, of course, founded on the prayer used in the First Book of Edward VI.—See Parker's *First Prayer-Book*, p. 242 *sq.*

The passage still holds its place in the Communion Office used at the present day in the Church in Scotland where the incumbent and a majority of the congregation desire it: a fact that is strangely omitted by Dr. Luckock, but which materially strengthens the arguments of those who plead for a fuller recognition of the practice in our own Prayer-Book, whenever the day for revision may come. We have no doubt that this omission, which must be purely accidental, will be rectified in a new edition, which will soon be wanted for a book of such universal interest.

Digitized by Google

And thus the result of the labours of Convocation on this clause was to bring it into complete harmony with the altered clause in the Burial Service. Had the words been left as they passed the Committee, they would have been an authoritative sanction of prayer for the departed in a most direct form; had the clause of the bidding prayer been adopted as it stood, such prayer would have seemed to be excluded: but the words as altered by Convocation left the question to the decision of the individual conscience. Those who wish to remember the departed saints at God's altar, and pray for their full fruition, can still do so in words which the Church puts into their mouths, and those who shrink from the practice are not compelled to follow it.

So far all is tolerably clear, but there is more difficulty about the history of the title of the prayer, both here and where it is mentioned in the first rubric at the end of the Communion Service. The words suggested by Cosin, and adopted by the Committee, were apparently at first accepted by Convocation with a slight modification, so that in the Convocation copy, the old title, '[Let us pray for the] whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth,' is erased, and over it is written, '[Let us pray for the] good estate of the Catholick Church of Christ.' This, however, is in its turn erased, and over it is written the original title of 1552, which we still retain. All these alterations are made by Sancroft's pen, but in the margin we find, in a different handwriting—which is only found once besides in the whole book—this direction: 'The title stand just as it was before.' A pen has, however, been drawn through these words, probably by Sancroft, when he made the final correction.

The title of the prayer is, as we have already noticed, mentioned again in the first rubric at the close of the Service. Here, as at its first occurrence, Cosin suggested the substitution of 'good estate of the Catholick Church of Christ,' for 'the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth.' The alteration was accepted by the Committee, passed by Convocation, and *stands unaltered in the Convocation book to this day.* We now turn to the 'annexed book,' which, it must be remembered, is entirely in MS. Here we find that the clerk who copied the book had in both passages written 'good estate of the Catholick Church of Christ,' and in *both* passages the words are erased, and the 'whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth' substituted in their place, and the alteration in each case is in Sancroft's hand. It is clear, then, that the final alteration of the title (where it first occurs) in

Digitized by Google

the Convocation copy, was made *after* the 'annexed book' had been copied by the scribe; but is it possible to trace it any further, so as to assign the date and author to the correction? It would seem that it is; for there is preserved in the House of Lords a book containing some minutes of Select Committees from 1661 to 1664, in which we read, under the date Thursday, February 27 [1662]:—'In the rubric after the Communion the words for the good estate, &c., to be made as in the — page, the whole estate, &c.[1]

Thus the title, when it stands at the head of the prayer, had been reduced to its present form *before* February 27. The alteration *may* have been made by Convocation before the book was signed on December 20, 1661,[2] but from the evidence brought forward by Mr. Parker[3] it seems far more probable that it, together with the alteration of two of the rubrics at the opening of the Communion Service, was made while the book lay for two months in the hands of the King,[4] and possibly the addition of the 'Black Rubric' is due to the same influence; but as in each case the alterations are made in Sancroft's hand, there can be little doubt that they were agreed to by Convocation (although made *after* the 'annexed book' had been signed on December 20), and whatever shadow of doubt there might still be is dispelled by reading the following passages from the *Journal of Convocation* for March 5:—

'Debate concerning some emendations or other alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, made by the House of Parliament. And the said Lord Bishop of London, with the consent of the House [entrusted] the care of the revision of the said alterations to the Reverend the Bishops of St. Asaph, Carlisle, and Chester, and gave them power and commission, jointly and singly, in the name of the whole of the Upper House of Convocation, to amend and correct the said alterations.'

'When this was done, the President commanded me to summon the Prolocutor. And when he came, with two or three members of the Lower House, the said President informed him what had been done about the said alterations, and to whose care they had been entrusted; and he asked him at once to communicate this to the Lower House, so that their consent might be obtained. Thereupon

[1] See Parker's *Introduction*, p. ccccli.
[2] So Lord Selborne, *Liturgical History*, p. 68.
[3] *Introduction*, pp. ccccxlix–cccclvi.
[4] As the book only reached the House of Lords on February 25, and the Committee for uniformity apparently met for the first time on the 27th, the alteration must have been made before the book was laid before Parliament.

Digitized by Google

the said Prolocutor, with his companions, returned to the Lower House, in presence of me, William Fisher, notary public, &c., gave their consent unanimously to all and everything done by the said bishops concerning the aforesaid alterations, saving their privileges, &c.'[1]

The history of the title is, however, not complete yet. The sealed books, it will be remembered, were supposed to be exact copies of the 'annexed book,' but they were certainly not printed from it, and sundry alterations had to be made by the Commissioners before they were brought into conformity with it; and, among other points, we notice that this unfortunate title, when it stands at the end of the Communion Service, was printed as it occurs in the Convocation copy, and therefore the words 'whole state,' &c., are 'in some copies written upon an erasure, which has been made by the knife. . . . In other copies they are written above the printed words, which are marked through with the pen,'[2] and still more curious is the fact that in the ordinary copies of the Prayer-Book of 1662, as issued to the public, the words are left unaltered—'For the good estate of the Catholick Church of Christ.'

We have traced somewhat minutely the changes of this title more as a matter of historical interest than for any real importance attaching to it. Had the alteration suggested by Cosin been finally adopted, it would hardly have been fair to have argued from it that the interpretation of the last clause as a direct prayer for the departed was the only one allowable; and so now it can scarcely be urged that the heading precludes us from including in our prayer all those departed this life in the faith and fear of Christ. Whatever the title may be, the clause is ambiguously worded, and we think that the ambiguity is designed. The final alteration of the title back to the form of 1552 was undoubtedly, as Mr. Parker points out,[3] 'a concession to the Puritan party,' but it was not of necessity an exclusion of all prayer for the dead from the Eucharistic Service, much less does it amount to a repudiation of the practice by the Church of England.

The passages hitherto discussed have been those, which must be allowed by all to refer to the departed, even by those who shrink from the conclusion that they contain direct prayer for such; but we cannot conclude without a reference to one other prayer in the Communion Service, the words of which have stood unchanged since they were

[1] Quoted in Parker's *Introduction*, p. cccclxii.
[2] *Ibid.* p. clxxii.
[3] *Ibid.* p. cccclv.

Digitized by Google

first inserted in 1549. The prayer alluded to is that generally known as the Prayer of Oblation, which now stands as the first of the Post-Communion prayers. It is well known that in 1549 it formed part of the Consecration Prayer, from which it was separated in 1552, when it was placed in the position, which it has ever since occupied; but throughout this clause has remained untouched: 'Most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and Death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we, *and all Thy whole Church*, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion.'

If it is said that the words italicized refer only to the living, we would reply (1) that they *need* not be so interpreted; (2) that comparing them with the title of the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth,' the omission of these last words is noticeable, for the *whole* Church (in Bishop Cosin's words) 'consists of more than those that are upon the earth;'[1] and (3) that their history and the date of their insertion favour the view that they were intended to include all the faithful, whether living or departed. At any rate they are capable of this interpretation (and it is only liberty for which we are pleading): nor is it a novelty. Bishop Cosin, in his first series of *Notes on the Prayer-Book*, writes as follows:—

'This is a plain oblation of Christ's death once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it, for the sins, and for the benefit, of the whole world, of the whole Church; that both those which are here on earth, and those that rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ, may find the effect of it.'[2]

And in the second series of *Notes* by the same writer, we find this remarkable passage:—

'By "all the whole Church" is to be understood as well those that have been heretofore, and those that shall be hereafter, as those that are now the present members of it. (And hereupon my Lord of Winchester, Bishop Andrewes, grounded his answer to Cardinal Perron, when he said, "We have and offer this sacrifice both for the living and the dead, as well for them that are absent, as those that be present;"[3] or words to this purpose, for I have not the book now by me.) And by "all other benefits of His passion" is intended no less the victory that we shall all have over death and sin at the last day, that is the resurrection of our bodies from the grave, and the public acquittal, which will then be given us from all

[1] *Works*, vol. v. p. 107. [2] *Ibid.* p. 119.

[3] Bishop Andrewes' words are: 'The Sacrifice of Christ's death is available for present, absent, living, dead (yea, for them that are yet unborn).'—Answer to Cardinal Perron, *Minor English Works*, p. 20.

Digitized by Google

our sins (when Christ shall pronounce His final sentence, and say, "Come ye blessed," &c.) than the remission of sins past to be now given us. So that the virtue of this sacrifice (which is here in this prayer of oblation commemorated and represented) doth not only extend itself to the living, and those that are present, but likewise to them that are absent, and them that be already departed, or shall in time to come live and die in the faith of Christ.'[1]

Enough has, we trust, been said to show that while the English Church leaves her children perfectly free to pray for the faithful departed in their private devotions, she has so constructed her public services, that they can be used by all, whether they adopt or shrink from the practice. A careful consideration of the passages here adduced leads to the conclusion that the expressions used were designedly adopted in order to leave room for difference of interpretation. There is nothing to offend any one. People with different views on the subject of prayers for the departed may kneel side by side at the same altar, and with equal honesty join from their heart in the words spoken by the priest, some pleading only for the members of the Church militant here in earth; others, better instructed, including in their petition all those departed in the faith and fear of Christ: and we can humbly trust that He 'to whom all hearts are open, and all desires known' will hear and accept alike the smaller and the larger prayer.

ART. II.—ALEARDO ALEARDI.

1. *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi.* (Firenze, 1878.)
2. *Epistolario di Aleardo Aleardi, con una Introduzione di G. Trezza.* (Verona, 1879.)

> 'Pallida vita! e tu saresti il grande
> Avvenimento degli umani e il solo?
> Il Passato è una larva a cui l'oblio
> Va scancellando i languidi profili;
> Il Presente non altro è che il veloce
> Avvenire che arriva.'
>
> (*Canti di Aleardo Aleardi.—'Lettere a Maria,'* p. 140.)

ALEARDO ALEARDI has been described by a native critic, like Napoleon in Manzoni's Ode, as alternately 'nella polvere' and

[1] *Works*, vol. v. p. 351; cf. Luckock, p. 242.

Digitized by Google

'sugli altar.' 'Sugli altar,' when his poetry thrilled through Italian hearts, and nerved them to the great struggle for the liberty of their country; 'nella polvere' when, that liberty being accomplished, they could, from the safe shore of their assured freedom, 'turn to the perilous wide waste and stand and gaze.' But although the comparison may contain some elements of truth, it would be an injustice to Italy to take it in its literal sense. Aleardi's countrymen would be the last to strip the leaves from the poet's laurel, even though the crown may have been hastily adjudged; nor would they be likely to scan with too cold a criticism the fervent lines which emboldened them to break free from the hateful foreign yoke.

Aleardo Aleardi was born at a period when that yoke was most oppressive. Venetian Lombardy had again fallen into the hands of Austria; and the faint hope once cherished by the population as to the preservation of those privileges which, as a Cisalpine Republic, they had enjoyed under the Empire of the first Napoleon, was soon dissipated. Austria held them once more in her iron grasp. All trace of nationality, patriotism, or historical tradition must be obliterated. The Austrian flag waved once again over the fair plains of Lombardy; and under this banner the flower of her youth were compelled to fight in far-off countries wherever it was the good pleasure of a Prince whose name was scarcely familiar to them, and for a nationality not their own.

Verona was chosen by the Austrian Empire for the head-quarters of their administration, and here the surveillance was so strict, that the press was subjected to severe censure, and all newspapers were forbidden except the *Gazetta di Milano*, the organ and instrument of the Government.

At this crisis, and in this the centre of the struggle between oppression and patriotism, Aleardo Aleardi was born. He was of noble birth, the last of his line, one of the oldest families in Verona, but his patrimony was small. His parents, Giorgio and Maria Canali, belonged to the class of small landowners which abound in Italy, and more especially in Lombardy, where the property is much subdivided.[1] The father, after having taken some slight part in the political strife to which his native country was a prey, saw the ancient Republic of Venice succumb before the French arms. He watched with anxiety the development of the new system of government introduced with such large promises of liberty by the invading foreigner, and, mistrusting their fulfilment, he withdrew from

[1] *Epistolario di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 101, 2.

Digitized by Google

the field of politics to spend the remainder of his life in domestic retirement. He had two children only, one daughter, Beatrice, and one son, Aleardo Aleardi.

We pass briefly over Aleardi's childhood. It gave but little promise of the genius which was to show itself in after years. Removed from his home before he was ten years old, and placed in the College of Santa Anastasia, he pined for the love and tenderness of his mother, the delightful freedom of his country rambles, and drooped like a flower rudely transplanted from its native soil. He lost all the spring and joy of childhood, became taciturn and morose, was disheartened as to his studies, often in disgrace, the lowest in the school, nicknamed, by his schoolfellows, the 'talpa' (mole), the more to signify his incapacity. For six years he was in this way the despair of his masters, the cause of the bitterest disappointment to his parents. The poetry of Virgil seems at last to have roused his dormant faculties. A new interest awakened in his mind, from which the clouds seemed suddenly dispelled; and his tutors, who had looked upon the slowness of his progress as a marvel, were now equally astonished by its rapidity.

The impetus of this new start emancipated him from the trammels of the school which had been so irksome to him. He left Santa Anastasia, and pursued his studies at the most ancient and celebrated University of Italy. Padua, while under the wing of the Lion of S. Mark, had been the resort of the most learned professors of Europe; but under the Austrian supervision it had lost much of its power and reputation, the Government being guided in their choice of the professors by political intrigue, paying little regard to their proficiency in science. Here, then, Aleardi continued his education, adding to the drier study of the law a careful training in the physical and natural sciences, the fruit of which often appears in his poetry. But while his mind became gradually enriched with different stores of learning, the idea of patriotism remained predominant. He read Dante, and then, casting a glance over his country, perceived how little the people, divided, oppressed, and enslaved, responded to those earnest appeals, which had struck a responsive chord in his own heart; and the longing to inspire them with the same enthusiasm grew daily more strong within him. A few stray pieces of political poetry, while they revealed his patriotic aspirations, easily won for him the poet's laurel, and made him the central figure among his fellow-students. Even these trifling verses did not escape the vigilance of the Austrian police. Their suspicions,

Digitized by Google

once awakened, fastened themselves upon the unhappy Aleardi, and from that moment he was closely watched.

His favourite walking-stick, in the top of which was inserted an ancient Italian *lira*, bearing a crown, and the inscription 'Regno d'Italia,' was looked upon with the deepest suspicion. One day it was missing; the next he was summoned before the police magistrate. 'Did the walking-stick belong to him?' showing the luckless cane. 'Why had it that emblem?' pointing to the *lira*. 'Because it was the first money that ever came into my hand,' replied Aleardi, undaunted. He was remanded, but from that day his name was recorded with a black mark in the Austrian books.

Aleardi, after this adventure, was more guarded in his conduct and kept a careful watch over the manuscript of the poetical composition in which he found a *sfogo* for his patriotic ideas. These were only circulated among his intimate friends, all more or less distinguished names in modern Italian literature, Prati, Gazzoletti, Fusinato, Somma and Dell' Ongaro.

In the society of such kindred spirits, and in the midst of all the gay carelessness of University life, gifted with a boundless, restless imagination, he passed the years of his early manhood. But the closing years of his studies at Padua were darkened by a great sorrow, the death of his mother. Her loss was keenly felt by Aleardi. He sketches her portrait with reverent touches in some of his most pathetic lines: 'Give me back,' he cries, with passionate yearning, 'the days of my youth—

> 'That I may see my Mother's tender gaze,
> Her full dark eye. Didst thou not seem to me
> As some fair pilgrim passing through the earth,
> Or as the sun's sweet ray immaculate
> Upon a stagnant waste; or like the petals
> Of a fragrant rose, too swiftly scattered
> Upon the stream of time, and borne away?
> Yet in the inner chamber of my heart
> Thy perfume lingers yet. From thee first came
> The fount of poetry which springs within,
> And if perchance my Italy should shed
> Some leaves from Fame's bright wreath upon my brow,
> The laurel crown shall wreathe thy sepulchre,
> For it is thine.'[1]

In a short time another domestic tie equally precious was severed. The husband only survived his wife two years, and Aleardi and his sister Beatrice were left orphans in the world.

[1] *Un' Ora della mia Giovinezza*, p. 8.

Digitized by Google

Aleardi's early taste for poetry and his poetical gifts, instead of being a cause of pride, had always been a source of great uneasiness to his father. Twice over he warned his son most emphatically against putting himself 'sulla via del poeta.'

'It will lead you all astray, and your life will never cease to be restless and unhappy. Let poetry alone, and choose instead a more sober and a more certain companion for your life. Choose the law.'[1]

Aleardi promised, though with great reluctance, to follow this advice, and, to please his father, on quitting the University of Padua, continued his studies in jurisprudence under the great jurist, Grassotti. For a little time he persevered, but Nature had made him a poet, or rather, as he says, with the modesty which characterized him, had planted in his soul a most irrepressible 'passion for poetry, for it requires a good deal of courage to say that one is a poet,'[2] and he was at last constrained to obey her dictates. But his poetry was to be no mere idle day-dream; he meant to be a 'poeta civile,' his country's bard, destined, as he fondly hoped, in his youthful enthusiasm, to accomplish the deliverance of Italy.

With this mission clearly before him, he composed his first great poem; but the moment was not yet ripe for an open display of his patriotic views: so he retraces his steps some 300 years, and borrows the robe of past history, with which to clothe them. The theme could not fail to be popular with Italians. It was the gallant defence of Cyprus by the Venetian Republic against the Turks, and particularly the siege of Nicosia.

Driven from pillar to post by the fierce attack of their enemies, the brave handful of Christians were gathered together in Nicosia, there to make one last stand against the Turks. This is the scene of Aleardi's poem entitled *Arnalda di Roca*, from the heroine, a daughter of the house of Roca, one of the noblest of the Cypriote families. The Venetian historian Sagredi describes in a few quaint words the incidents which form the argument of the poem:—

'On July 25, 1570, the Turks besieged Nicosia. After fifteen vain assaults, at last, on September 9, they entered the city by the breaches. Fifteen thousand people were put to death, the rest sold for slavery. The ruin of the city had been foretold by a comet. One ship, amongst the other slave-laden ships, was freighted with a cargo of beautiful Cypriote women destined as a present for the Sultan. Among these Arnalda di Roca, worthy of a crown rather than of chains, free of soul, if fettered in body, seeing the fearful fate that

[1] *Due Pagine autobiografiche*, p. xiii. [2] *Ibid.* p. xiv.

Digitized by Google

was in store for her, set fire to the ammunition, and blew the ship into the air. 'Thus,' says the quaint historian, 'did she set on fire the funeral pile of her country, to be born again as a Phœnix to the glories of Heaven, and this was the last flame which celebrated the obsequies of what had once been the capital of a most flourishing kingdom.'

This poem, *Arnalda di Roca*, is supposed to have been written on the anniversary of the loss of Cyprus. On this day, and every other anniversary, which records either a past disaster, or a past triumph, in the history of the ancient Republic, the poet's fanciful conception describes the ghost of the old 'Bucentaur' putting out to sea, carrying on board a goodly company of Doges and Venetian statesmen, who, rising from their long-forgotten tombs, set forth to revisit the scene of many a hard-fought battle both by sea and land.

'This, then, is the day
That Cyprus fell, and thus a priceless pearl
Passed from the ducal diadem, to deck
The jewel-hilted sword, the reeking blade
Of yon Byzantine lord! Lo! yestere'en
In the dead hour of midnight, solemn, still,
While the forsaken gondolas lay chained
To the deserted shore, nor sound nor tread
Broke the deep silence of the quiet streets,
The phantom semblance of the golden ship
"Bucentaur" rose and glided by. Her sails
Rent standards; and her oars, the rusting halberds
Of a bygone age; still from the high-curved prow
The dying lion watched the fated course
Whose broken wing flapped as an unfilled sail
In that dead calm. The porticoes
And stately steps, churches and palaces,
Seemed as if alive with shadowy forms
Rich in the garb of Doge or Senator;
Who ever, as the phantom ship drew nigh,
Went forth to meet it, o'er those dark, still depths
Passing with trackless feet. They reach the deck,
Weird welcome interchanged; the ship glides on.
But, as they pass the point where dash and foam
The breakers 'gainst the giant marble walls,[1]
A gale mysterious rose, and whence it came
None knew; which urg'd them swift as lightning's flash
Through the dark clouds of night. Like frighted steeds
The Istrian shores flee from their sight, and next
Pola's deserted amphitheatre,

[1] These sea-walls, called *murazzi*, were built of solid marble in the year 1776.

Digitized by Google

Dalmatia's rock-bound coast: along the line
Point after point appears, recedes, is gone:
Only one fragrant breath Corcyra wafts
From valleys fair, and orange-laden groves.
Still must the ship drive onwards on her course,
And ever as she speeds past cape and gulf,
Scenes of Venetian combat oft renewed,
Rise as the witness of those sturdy fights
Torn planks, masts, oars, and figure-head,
Forth from their sandy grave, hid fathoms deep,
And follow, swimming, in the phantom's wake.
But as they reach Lepanto's well-known shore,
Behold Lepanto's towers; as if by touch
Of magic wand, that strong wind fell; the shades
In serried ranks drew to the vessel's side.
But vain the menace of the outstretched arm,
And vain the semblance of the glittering blade
Piercing the gloom; while through Morea's gulf,
Epirus' lone shore, the mutt'ring sound
Of imprecation, fierce and deep outburst,
In agonized laments, which fill the air.
The breeze returning gathered up the sound
And bore it onwards. Onwards stood the ship
Devouring spaces in her headlong course;
Thy swelling hills, fair Cythĕra, they pass,
Where the soft murmur of the turtle dove
Wakes gentle echoes in thy myrtle groves,
And Crete, where still, unsepulchred,
Her hundred cities lie. The eyrie next
Of Christian eagle, Rhodes, whose battlements,
Once mightiest, now black and shattered stand,
And, if in midnight voyage some passing bark
Come 'neath that fort, haply her sails might catch
The dim, faint outline of the warrior souls
Keeping a ghostly watch; the crew, dismayed,
Seized with a mystic sense of loss and death,
Pause awe-struck, shiv'ring in the cold night breeze.
Cyprus at length stretched forth her rocky arms,
The ship ran in, her phantom voyage was o'er,
And the sad shades dispersed throughout the isle.'[1]

Then follows the story. The scene is laid in Nicosia; the time, September 9, 1576. It is night, and the city, closely invested by the Ottoman armies, is wrapped in the deepest obscurity. But there stands the palace of the 'Roca,' one of the noblest of the Cypriote families. Dark against the midnight sky, a single lamp burns in one of the windows; it is flickering and paling before the approaching dawn, which

[1] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 448, 450.

Digitized by Google

streaks with light the distant Syrian sea. The beautiful Arnalda di Roca, the heroine of the story, is seated at the balcony-window; the forgotten lute is by her side; the Bible, the 'divin libro, che primo

'Scritto dall' uom, fia letto ultimo in terra,'

is open at the account of Judith's return from the Assyrian's tent. Arnalda gazes out upon the night, and in her thoughts she envies the Jewish heroine, for she is distracted by the prospect of the impending ruin of her country, which she has long foreseen. From her childhood, the gay companions of her own age, fair Cypriote damsels, like herself, have called her in sport a prophetess, because she would predict coming events from long habits of observation, and the careful study of the book of nature, wherein she learned to love 'Dio, la patria, i parenti.' All—her religion, her country, her father in his old age, Nello (Sir di Saido), her betrothed knight—are now threatened by the approaching catastrophe; and if any thought of hope crosses her mind, it falls instantly dead, as the hapless bird which flies over the Asphaltic Lake. There are some moments, Aleardi says, when the sorrows of life are so desperate that they appear to lift one corner of the veil of futurity and to enable you to see beyond it. Arnalda, overcome with the sad thoughts suggested by her prophetic soul, tormented by the hot vapours which rise from the scorching plain, goes down into the garden, and there makes an agonized prayer for the safety of her country and those she loves. 'Save, O Lord,' she cries, 'my father's hoary head, my Nello's gallant heart, and if one of our house must fall a martyr, let it be me alone.' Absorbed in grief, she has not noticed the clash of arms, the soldier's quick step. Nello has heard the prayer of self-sacrifice, and stoops to comfort her. Hope will not die in his breast so long as there beats one loyal heart, or one lance remains to be broken. But Arnalda points to the vacant space on the top of the dome of the Santa Sofia of Cyprus, where the cross had been shattered by the enemy's cannon, too sure a presage of its future destiny in the infidel's hands. Then, in the full certainty that death is coming upon them, she relates to him an episode in her life, which she had hitherto concealed from him: how that, when on a pilgrimage with her father to the Holy Land, they had been overtaken by a sand-storm in the desert, and would have perished had it not been for a young Arab chief, then an exile in the desert, now the head of the Ottoman army. 'He asked me,' she adds, 'for my love, but I had

Digitized by Google

none to give him, only gratitude and pity. Oh, my Nello! I have one boon to ask of thee, in the fierce hour of battle do not aim thy blows at one who had compassion on my father as he lay fainting in the sultry desert!' The battle begins. Arnalda's father stands upon the ramparts of his castle with no thought but for his country and Arnalda. These two strong affections grapple to his soul as closely as the ivy which mantles round the ancient battlements on which he leans. But in vain the courageous defence of the handful of Christians against the hordes of Mussulman troops. 'Oh!' exclaims the Italian patriot, with his heart full of his own country's wrongs, 'is there a sadder sight upon this earth than when a hapless nation as one man marches with unflinching step into the very jaws of death, rather than become the slave of the conqueror?' The Conte dei Roca rallies his men for one last sally, is mortally wounded by an arrow sent from Assano's (the Arab chieftain's) bow, and is carried into a neighbouring church, and there stretched at the foot of one of the royal tombs, while the setting sun streamed in purple rays through the painted glass, the dying soldier opens his eyes to find his daughter hanging over him. The dialogue between the father and the daughter is very fine.[1] 'Arnalda,' he cries, 'look from the topmost window, what seest thou?' She, struck to the heart with anguish, fearing to leave him, yet anxious to obey his last commands, climbs with tottering feet the stone steps in the belfry, gains the highest window, whence she can see the whole of the city, and the wide plain stretched out at its feet. The battering of the guns shakes the painted glass in the windows, the vaults below give back the sound. There is a noise of approaching steps. Arnalda descends in haste to defend her dying father with her last strength. Nearer and nearer comes the sound; the gallop of a horse at utmost speed. It is here; it is gone; no, exactly in the centre of the porch, it stays as of itself. For the first time Arnalda turns pale. The dying Count recognizes the well-known step. 'Sir di Saïdo,' he cries, 'is then all lost?' Their worst fears are confirmed. The father confides his daughter to Nello's care, sees their hands joined in betrothal, and expires. His eyes are scarcely closed in death when the enemy bursts into the church. Assano is at their head. 'Sposa, siam perduti!' Nello cries, as he springs to his feet to fight sword in hand the last fight of despair. The crowd surrounded the two combatants as at a tournament.

[1] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 447, 8.

Digitized by Google

The Lord of Saldo gains a vantage ground on a piece of broken column, and fights with desperate courage. The curved blue scimitar of the Infidel is about to fall on his bare head, when the horse of the assailant loses its footing on the smooth pavement, and falls; the hollow tomb beneath giving way beneath his weight, horse and rider bite the dust. Nello's victory is certain, when, from the farther end of the church, there comes the hiss of a ball, and he falls to the ground. Then all is over.

The third and last canto relates the fate of Arnalda. When the fatal ball struck Nello, she swooned; and she wakes from her trance to find herself in the power of the Mohamedan chief. In one instant the past flashed back, the future dawned, she felt at the point of death. 'Ah! hapless Arnalda, dost thou not know that griefs, even the most awful, have *not* death at their call?' The Ottoman fleet returns to Constantinople; two ships, laden with prisoners, make their sad way over the sea. Among the Cypriote women the hapless freight of one bark is a poor lady, half-crazed with grief, to whom, disregarding her own depth of sorrow, Arnalda ministers. Because—

> 'If e'er misfortune strike a noble heart,
> It straightway yields its purest treasure forth;
> Treasures of love, unknown to happy days,
> Making it tender of another's woes.'

But if she is capable of the tenderest offices of pity, she is also equal to the most heroic deeds of valour. The vessel, continuing its voyage, passes the waters of Settaglia, calmed by the Sacred Relic, with which the Empress Helena assuaged their fury when returning with her inestimable prize from Golgotha. The imprisoned damsels are allowed to breathe the soft evening air on the deck; and from a solitary height along the coast the bell rings the Ave Maria. They fall on their knees; Arnalda recalls her mother's violated tomb, her father's unburied head, her Nello struck with mortal wound, and her lips move in prayer for the dying and dead. All the while the poor crazed soul measures the deck with her meaningless glance, accompanied with wild snatches of her native song. On a sudden, Arnalda is moved by an inspiration to attempt the deliverance of the unhappy captives. If she fails, the worst that can befall her is death. Her words, the prospect of liberty, have power to inspire the poor stricken does with the rage of the lioness; they incite the galley-slaves to revolt, among whom is Nello, and many

Digitized by Google

of the warriors who had so lately fought for their country, and now, chained to the oar, are forced to conduct the vessel on her melancholy way.

Arnalda, with her own hands, sets Nello free. A desperate fight ensues. The Ottoman crew are overcome, and, for a brief period, the captive-laden ships are free. 'Cipro vincemmo,' the Lord of Sardo once more utters his war-cry. 'Fratelli, al remo!' In the delirium of joy, as he clasps the hand of his betrothed, the tears, which no misfortune could wring from him, spring to his eyes. Alas! how brief the joy. Another ship appears on the horizon. To arms! to arms! it is Hassan's ship; and silently, steadily, darkly, leaving a white track behind her, she comes on. The fugitives crowd all sail in breathless agony and suspense, for there is no heart so brave which does not palpitate at the approach of death; and when the moment of dissolution draws nigh, the soul flies upward to meet 'il Dio che s'avvicina.' The chase is soon over; shot and shell fall like thunderbolts on the unhappy vessel; and in the brief succeeding pause the mountains give back the echo. Once again the enemy is on board, and the death struggle begins. It is long and fierce; who does not know how desperately the free man will fight, whose arms still bear the livid impress of the captive's chain; and when the dawn arose it seemed as if only the hollow shell of the ship floated upon the waters.

Arnalda, where art thou? Art thou hidden? Assano seeks all over the wrecked ship for any trace of thee. Or has Death taken thee into his merciful arms? Silent, wounded, more deathly pale than the vestal tapers which burn before the altars, her only trust in God, the daughter of Roca yet lives, crouched in the corner of the vessel where a store of gunpowder remains unharmed, guarded to the last with jealous care. There in dead silence she waits for death. Alas! even this last asylum is no longer to be hers. The falcon has found the traces of the wounded dove, and swoops down. The Arab conqueror approaches with demoniac light in his eyes, followed by two Ethiopian slaves. One carries a bowl filled to the brim, and covered with cloth of gold. 'I bring to my Houri the most precious gem the East can produce to lay at her feet.' Then, with a demon's laugh, he threw back the cover, and displayed the bleeding head of her betrothed. Arnalda let no look betray the horror of her soul. She kneeled down; she raised her eyes to heaven, and made her prayer to the great God of her fathers. Then, with immoveable calm, she took a pistol from her bosom, applied the short barrel to

Digitized by Google

the gunpowder, and, with firm hand, drew the trigger. In an instant, living and dead, the tyrant and the captive, tormentor and the victim, and the swift ships, the scene of the late deadly strife, disappear amid a sheet of fire, and clouds of smoke like the 'baseless fabric of a vision.' The foamy waters part in circles to receive back in showers the fragments which tell the tale of that destruction. 'Tutto passò.' The calm which precedes the dawn smiles on the quiet waters; the silence returns to the lately-troubled air; the oranges and lavender upon the mountain-paths give forth their first fragrant morning perfume; the lark rises singing to heaven's gate; no trace of the late furious strife, misery, and bitter hatred remains but the faint cloud of smoke, which hovers over the water where the combat raged.

And now the phantom ship again puts forth to sea on her homeward voyage, and the stately shades troop back to their tombs to pillow their heads in dust; the 'Bucentaur' returns as she went forth, save that on her topmost yard she bears the relic of a martyr; that martyr who, as a brilliant star, must ever shine in the firmament of the Cyprus skies. In these last lines Aleardi alludes to the still more famous siege of Famagosta, and the martyrdom of the hero Bragadino.

It was at one time his intention to have dealt with this subject in a dramatic poem. He worked at it when in villeggiatura with his sister Beatrice, to whom he was passionately attached; but the manuscript was lost, and the poem never published.

His next poem, *Le Prime Storie*, was dedicated to his father. It was written in 1845, though it did not see the light till 1857.

We have already alluded to the keen sympathy felt by Aleardi for the fate of Lord Byron. His romantic death in the cause of liberty, his enthusiastic poetry in praise of their country, were still fresh in the minds of the Italians, when Aleardi wrote one of his best poems, *Il Monte Circello*, composed in imitation of *Childe Harold*. It was originally written in four cantos, but only one of these, the last, was ever printed. Like *Childe Harold*, Aleardi had wandered all over Italy, and knew every inch of her beloved soil. The scene of his poem opens with a description of the rock from which the poem takes its name, the ancient 'Capo di Circe,' at the western extremity of the Pontine Marshes. It was the gentle twilight hour, which seems like the kiss of peace to a fevered brow; the evening vapours were rising from the steaming plain; the golden cloud of insects—'nati al mattino e al vespero

Digitized by Google

già vecchi'—had but just disappeared, when a vision passed before Aleardi's eyes. A phantom bard crowned with laurel stood upon that cloud-capped summit; his long, hoary hair was confined by the Grecian band; his garments were rude and old, and he seemed to feel his way like a blind man When he struck the golden chords of his lyre, he turned his face to the sea. And then Aleardi recognized the blind bard, who, while the earth was yet in her infancy, was Emperor of Song, who told of the fierce wrath of Achilles, and Hector's cruel fate, the wanderings of Ulysses, his wisdom and his revenge. The vision disappears at the end of the song, and the sole vestige which remains of the mendicant bard, whose tattered garment was worth the robes of a hundred emperors, is a branch of laurel.

Aleardi next descends into the famous Pontine Marshes, the grave of many a forgotten city. This description of the plain so fair and fruitful in appearance, but containing in every furrow the germs of death to the reapers who from generation to generation are sent down from the Abruzzi to gather in the harvest, is looked upon as a masterpiece by his native critics.

The bay of Naples suggests the piteous fate of Conradine of Swabia, familiar to us in the *Purgatorio* (xx. 67–9), but whose portrait as painted by Aleardi awakens our sympathy anew:—

'The youth,
Pale, beautiful, his locks of curling gold,
His eyes the colour of the sapphire bay,
His open brow marked by misfortune's stamp.
. . . The Swabian star
Glittered in silver on his azure crest,
Still on his breast the Swabian eagle shone.

. . . . . .

There on the scaffold pale and proud he stood,
And mid the surging crowd the gauntlet flung;
Who took it up, none knew! but when the fated hour
Clashed from each steeple in Palermo's town,
That glove became a living hand, and tolled
The knell which summoned Anjou's hated race
Before the Throne of God.' [1]

Terracina, Anzio, and the Appian Way, with its hundred miles of monuments, temples, and tombs, bygone relics of Roman splendour, are all treated in this, the one fragment which remains to us of a much larger scheme. The poem

[1] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, p. 78.

Digitized by Google

ends with an enthusiastic description of the dawn of Creation and the origin of Italy. Some of the lines are fine, but Aleardi was tempted by his love of physical science to embark in an elaborate account of the geological formation and development of his country, which makes the conclusion complicated, and to the uninitiated difficult to understand.

Aleardi's best composition was written in the following year (1847): he called it *Lettere a Maria.* It created a great sensation in Italy at the time, and will probably outlive his other works. It is divided into two parts, *L'Invito,* and *L'Immortalità dell' Anima.* One of Aleardi's biographers[1] tells us that originally there were two more *Lettere a Maria,* but that Aleardi in a fit of passion, thinking they were not appreciated by the person to whom he was reading them, threw them into the fire. Their loss, says the biographer, is the more to be regretted as the poet had often told him that they were the best part of the work. We can judge what they must have been by the two which remain, which contain some of his most beautiful lines. Nor is this surprising, when we learn that 'Maria' was his 'Laura,' and that his attachment to her was as hopeless, as chivalrous, as romantic, and as high-flown as that of Petrarch for Madame Laura de Sade. Another biographer, writing in 1863, tells us that the real Maria was at that time in existence, and that after many years of harassing anxiety, and after having advanced a long stage on the journey of life, she still remembers with infinite delight her moment of triumph when this poem first appeared, and made her the envy and admiration of all her countrywomen. Who she was we are not able to say; that she no longer lives we gather from a later poem of Aleardi's.

During the years 1846–7, the date of the two poems we have just been considering, the Italians gave many a proof of their ever-increasing hatred of the Austrian rule. They longed for some one to give voice to their shuddering indignation, to protest against the cruelty of their oppressors. In Aleardi they found an apt representative of their aspirations, and thus he obtained the wish of his heart in becoming the bard of Italian liberty. When a new poem by Aleardi was announced a feeling of hope sprang up even in the most despairing hearts, and they blessed the young poet who was not afraid to plead, in eloquent and pathetic lines, the cause of his country. At the first outbreak in Venice Aleardi was chosen

[1] *Prampolini,* p. 7. See also *Epistolario,* pp. 262, 263.

Digitized by Google

by Manin to form part of the Provisional Government, and was afterwards despatched as ambassador on their behalf to Paris, to enlist the sympathies of France in the cause of Italy.

Louis-Philippe was still on the throne. Every courtesy was shown to the envoy, but Aleardi soon perceived that little else was to be hoped for from his cold, selfish policy; still less from the revolution of June that same year, when France was entirely engrossed with her own affairs. Yet indirectly the success of the French revolution of 1848 exercised a powerful influence upon the movement for Italian freedom. By this time Carlo Alberto had cast in his lot with Italy; he was at the head of affairs, and Aleardi applied to the new Government for his recall, as there was nothing to be gained by a longer sojourn in France.[1] He left Paris, bidding adieu to Béranger, Lamennais,[2] and Mickiewitz, with whom he formed an enduring friendship, and returned to Italy, pausing for some time in Florence, where a courteous reception from Giusti and Capponi consoled him for his disappointment in the failure of his embassy. Meanwhile the insurrection was spreading in Italy. Bologna had risen to arms, and Aleardi hastened to the scene of action, to render what assistance he could. But the unequal struggle was soon over, the city capitulated, and Aleardi returned to Florence, till the entry of the Austrian troops; thence to Genoa, where he would have been content to remain, had he not been summoned to Verona by the mortal illness of an old friend, who had been his tutor, and had stood almost in the place of a parent to him since his father's death. For his sake, Aleardi exposed himself to the fury of the Austrian Government against the revolutionist, and arrived in time to minister to his friend during his last moments.

Verona received Aleardi with open arms, as the patriot who had done his utmost to ameliorate the condition of his fellow-citizens. For some little time he remained undisturbed, till unhappily the Austrian Government recollected that he had taken part in the too celebrated 'Processi di Mantua,' and he was thrown into prison in October 1852. He was at first confined in the military prison of S. Tommaso in Verona, from thence he was transferred to Mantua. The treatment which Aleardi received at the hands of the Austrians will be no surprise to those who have read *Le Mie Prigioni*, or Mr. Gladstone's eloquent essays upon the sufferings of the Neapolitans.[3]

[1] *Epistolario di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 21–71.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 52.
[3] Gladstone's *Gleanings*, vol. iv. pp. 1–135.

Digitized by Google

Aleardi was not chained to a fellow-sufferer, but in every other point his condition seems to have been equally hard to bear. The four prisons of Mantua being already choked with victims of the Austrian tyranny, one cell only was empty, so bad of its kind that it had hitherto been considered unfit for human occupation. Into this Aleardi was now thrown. It was narrow, damp, and not only that, but for eighteen hours of the day it was perfectly dark, and during the remaining six a grey twilight was the nearest approach to daylight. It contained literally no furniture, save a mattress on the floor. His prison fare consisted of two *pani* of black unleavened bread, which were brought to him in the morning, and a plate of soup later in the day. But neither solitude, nor obscurity, nor the pangs of hunger, nor the restraint—to a person of his disposition most cruel to bear—wrung from him a single complaint. He bore all in patient silence, freely forgiving in his heart those who were the cause of his sufferings. These were not only physical but moral. For some time he struggled against his anguish, and found some alleviation in composing poems, which he afterwards entitled *Ore cattive.* They occupy more than thirty pages of his collection of poems,[1] but they are inferior to his other works, and this is not surprising when we remember the circumstances in which they were written. After more than six weeks spent in this abominable cell, he was allowed to leave it for a short time in order to see his sister in one of the guard-rooms in the presence of the soldiers. His eyes, accustomed to the darkness in which he had been confined, were so dazzled by the light of day, that at first he could discern nothing. But as soon as he saw his sister, he spoke to her with calm cheerfulness, and said he was in want of nothing, lest she should be miserable in thinking of his sufferings. On his return to his cell, however, when he was alone, he threw himself upon the ground, where he remained for some hours in an agony of grief and despair. After three months his prison was changed, and for the better. He was now removed to one of the highest stories, and here he had light and air, and could see the cornice of the Basilica of S. Andrea (the great work of Leon Battista Alberti), from whence the pigeons flew to and fro, suggesting thoughts of liberty to the unhappy captive.

He was still without books or means of writing, and had not been able to commit to paper the poems which he had composed. At last, as a great concession, he was given a

[1] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 198–219.

Digitized by Google

German grammar and dictionary, to the study of which, glad of any occupation, he diligently applied himself. One night in December his sleep was interrupted by unaccustomed sounds, continued hammering, and marching to and fro: there appeared to be a general excitement. At last he became aware that these were preparations for the execution of some of the prisoners. A few days afterwards Aleardi and many others of the remaining prisoners were roused with the dawn, and conducted in prison vans to the Castle, where they were drawn up in a row; the list of names was called over, and by the silence which followed upon the reading of some of the names, Aleardi discovered which of his fellow-sufferers had fallen victims to the Austrian bullets. They were then taken into a piazza, while the rain poured down in torrents, and their pardon was announced to them. Pardon!—for what? It will be remembered that from the moment Aleardi was thrown into prison till the moment of his freedom, there had been no question of examination or trial as to whether he was innocent or guilty.

The Mantuans who had crowded round the gates of the Castle, received the liberated prisoners with enthusiasm, and offered them every kind of hospitality. Aleardi declined, fearing to expose his host to the future suspicions of the Austrians, and the next day returned to his native city. The hardships which he had suffered in prison had by no means daunted his courage, or diverted him from his self-chosen career.

Le Città Italiane marinare e commercanti[1] was his next work. From the dissolution of the Roman Empire, the time when Italy, as an Empire, was laid in the coffin ('discesa imperatrice entrò la bara'), he traces the existence which rises new-created from her ashes, and follows each Republic through its own gallant history.

First, the 'queen with an unequalled dower,' Venice, whose future S. Mark sees in a prophetic vision as he sails past the desolate lagune on his way to Aquileia. Before his eyes the phantom of a Byzantine Church hovers on the horizon of that labyrinth of sandy islands and reedy shores. There will his bones one day find an honoured resting-place beneath the golden cupolas, and over the portico :—

> 'Scintilleranno egregi e impazienti
> I destrier di Corinto.'[2]

[1] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 155, 169.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 161.

Digitized by Google

Or, in Byron's words, which might almost stand for a translation :—

'Before S. Mark shall glow his steeds of brass,
Their gilded collars glittering in the sun.'

And while rivals still slept, her galleys sped to bring the gems from the 'exhaustless East,' and pour them in sparkling showers into her lap. Ease and indolence followed upon such stupendous wealth, and other cities pressed forward to dispute with her the sovereignty of the seas.

First of all, Amalfi, with her well-known *tavola amalfitina* of Roman law, and her discovery of the compass. Then Pisa :—

'And from the Arno's shore fair Amazon,
Pisa, all beauty, and all valour, came,
In the sea joust an eager combatant,
Riding triumphant on her foam-dashed prows,
As on the back of untamed battle-steed.' [1]

Genova, *lionessa dell'onda*, the suzerain of Pera, and who, when the Old World did not yield sufficient wealth, unlocked the golden storehouse of the New Hemisphere, and cast its riches at the feet of Europe.

The Northern nations still lay wrapped in the slumber of the dark ages, restrained and repressed by feudal law, while the commonwealths of Italy were as hives of industry in the garden of the sunny South. Many a foreign palace glitters with Venetian crystals ; an empty heraldic decoration was the only repayment Florence ever received for the million of golden florins lent to the King of England in his need. Happy the warrior, of whatsoever nation he be, if in mortal fight his breast is covered with the corselet of Lombard steel. But now the crown of Venetian glory is cast down : the garlands of flowers which were showered upon her on the day of her annual marriage with the sea she scatters like a new Ophelia, one by one along her path. The tomb has closed over even this memory of her glorious past, and all that remains to her is 'La speranza e Dio.'

Early in the poem Aleardi alluded to the three successive stages of Italian life : first the Etruscan, next the Roman, and thirdly the Commercial and Maritime, when Italy was divided into many rival Republics. There was yet another existence

[1] 'Tremenda e bella
Tu pur scendevi alle marine giostre,
Balzando in cima alle spumanti prue
Come a selvaggi corridori in sella.'

Digitized by Google

in store for her, which he lived to see, when she became a nation's kingdom, in which the parts dissolved with the Roman Empire were again united, and the several communities, laying aside their rivalries and animosities, were combined in one whole; so that at last the 'gloria,' which he prayed for in the concluding lines of the poems, did indeed dawn :—

'Sui tre orizzonti della mia marina.'

But in the year 1856, when the poem was first published, this conjuncture of all the States in one independent nation was characterized by contemporary writers as a 'dream of enthusiasm and folly. Cavour was, however, laying the first stone in the building of the kingdom, by his protest against the Austrian system of repression and violent reaction, never relaxed since 1848, 49, which he laid before the Congress of Paris. The Italians were momentarily calmed by the prospect of an amelioration of their fate, but the negative result of the Congress raised the revolutionary spirit afresh. Three years later, and the noble little Kingdom of Sardinia again risked her whole existence in the cause of her oppressed fellow-countrymen. This time France came to the rescue, and the era of Italian independence seemed about to dawn. Aleardi again held aloft the nation's banner, in spite of the perils with which he was surrounded, in his *Canti Patrii*,[1] some of which, he says, in a letter to a friend, were written by twenty lines at a time with 'i birri alla porta,' and then concealed. Often the hiding-place was discovered, the papers destroyed, and the work had to be done over again. But as the destroyed papers were always replaced by Aleardi's fertile genius, it was not likely that he would be long left at liberty during this the crisis of Austrian rule in Lombardy. He was again arrested, his papers were searched, and he was first consigned to a prison in Verona, afterwards removed to Josephstadt, where he was again visited by his sister Beatrice. She was worthy to be called 'Amore, Benedizione, Allegrezza serena della mia vita agitata.' In these terms he dedicated to her one of his best compositions, *Accanto a Roma*, which contains a magnificent tribute to Dante.[2] Another equally fine passage paints with living touches the portrait of the 'divino infelice Tasso.'[3] Two of his companions were already condemned to death, and the faithful sister was in an agony of anxiety. 'But mind, Beatrice,' said Aleardi to her one day when she was with him in his prison, 'never entreat any one for my life.

[1] pp. 259–297.
[2] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, p. 106.
[3] *Ibid.* 113.

Digitized by Google

I would rather die a thousand times than owe my life to the favour of my country's enemy.'[1]

The Peace of Villafranca, while it destroyed his hopes of the deliverance of his country, set him at liberty, together with all the other political prisoners at Josephstadt.

Aleardi repaired to Brescia, where he was the object of the warmest sympathy and many a patriotic demonstration. He was offered the chair of Italian literature at the Instituto Filosofico, at Milan. This he did not accept, preferring the life of independence which he had from the beginning marked out for himself.

But the next year, from his place of retirement, Aleardi beheld the realization of his long-cherished hopes, beyond his utmost expectations. It was the year 1860; the whole interest of Europe fastened on Italy, when, says the *Annual Register*, 'we have to relate, not the obscure struggles of a faction, nor the abortive attempts of conspiracy, but the history of dynasties overthrown, of the union of the North with the South of Italy in one large kingdom, under the constitutional monarchy of the House of Savoy.'

To Garibaldi, who alike single-hearted and single-handed, cut the cords by which Southern Italy was bound, and set her free for ever, Aleardi dedicated his poem, entitled *I sette Soldati*.[2] The seven soldiers represent the seven nationalities oppressed by the House of Hapsburg—Hungarian, Pole, Bohemian, Croat, Austrian, Tyrolese, Italian—and in the morning after the battle Aleardi fancies himself walking over the battlefield, bending in turn over each of the dying heroes.

It is a long poem, and not equal to the occasion for which it was composed, though it contains many beautiful ideas, and some fine lines. Moreover, it was written in 1861, and Aleardi could not wholly rejoice in a freedom which was not shared by his own native province. A few years later, and Lombardy was also delivered from foreign rule. The day that (to quote the words of the late King) 'the Iron Crown was restored to Italy,' and he rode triumphant into Verona, was celebrated by Aleardi in some of his best lines.[3]

The temporal power of the Papacy was the only stumbling-block which now remained in the way of the perfect unity of the Italian kingdom. This stumbling-block, in the true spirit of Dante, Aleardi set himself to remove; but his efforts were no more successful than those of his great predecessor's,

[1] *Prampolini*, pp. 4, 5. See also *Epistolario*, p. 167.
[2] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, pp. 306–335. See also *Epistolario*, p. 176.
[3] *Aleardo Aleardi*, p. 393; *Epistolario*, p. 239.

Digitized by Google

although six centuries of experience had served to prove the truth of the immortal lines:—

'Come pesa il gran manto,
A chi dal fango 'l guarda;
Che piuma sembran tutte l'altre some.'[1]

But if the stern language of Dante fell upon unheeding ears, the imaginative metaphors of Aleardi were equally disregarded.

It was in vain that he employed by turns the language of persuasive entreaty and prophetic warning, first recalling to the recollection of Pius IX. the time when he was the desire of the people's hearts, when the people wept round the standard which he had blessed. Then his pastoral staff was worth all the sceptres of Europe, then every Italian hearth was sanctified, all Italy joined in one hymn of thanksgiving.[2] But these high hopes were all shipwrecked on the rock of Gaëta, and for the time the Holy See lost its influence over Italian hearts and minds. And then Aleardi describes with a hardy metaphor the triple crown of terror, shame, and anathema, weighing heavily upon the head 'd'un Vecchio infermo.' The poem from which we have just cited was dedicated to the 'venturo Pontefice' (the future Pope): but long before Leo XIII. succeeded to the Papal Chair the temporal power had succumbed before the irresistible march of events. Aleardi saw the last and noblest jewel restored to the crown of Italy in her ancient capital, and the fulfilment of the prophecy which he had himself made to the late King on one occasion when he was in his presence.

'Voi potrete dire con sublime orgoglio, O Sire, a vostro figlio: Umberto, ti io ho composto la più bella, la più gentile corona d'Europa.' He celebrated this last triumph of Italian liberty in a poem called *L'Aurora Boreale del 25 Ottobre 1870*.[3] Moreover, he witnessed the reconciliation of the Pope

[1] *Purgatorio*, XIX. 104.
'With what a weight that robe of sovereignty
Upon his shoulder rests, who from the mud
Would guard it, that each other fardel seems
But feathers in the balance.'—(Cary's Translation.)

[2] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, 402, 403:—
'Ogni privato ostello
Diveniva una chiesa . . .
Italia
Era un inno.

[3] In his letter upon the death of the late King (Jan. 11, 1878) Aleardi writes of his successor:—'Di Umberto io spero. Gagliardia e dignità, nobile orgoglio di seguitare le vestigia de suoi avi,' &c.—*Epistolario*, p. 373.

Digitized by Google

and the King before both passed, within a few weeks of each other, from the world where they had played such prominent parts, the succession of the young Prince to the kingdom which his father had made for him, the election of another Pope to face the still unsolved problem of his altered Sovereignty. Perhaps even the noble, unselfish character of the new Pontiff, his sound judgment and clear discernment may have awakened a fresh hope in Aleardi's breast that Rome, basking once more in the light of the 'Duo Soli,' whose several beams would 'cast light on either way, the world's and God's, would again take up her ancient task of turning the world to good.'[1]

Meanwhile Aleardi became a representative of the 'Italia Una,' in whose cause he had spent his life. He entered the Italian Parliament, held the chair of Æsthetics in Florence, became member of the Upper Council of Education, and was raised to the dignity of Senator. But these new offices distracted him from his art, for which indeed the prevailing motive had now ceased to exist. He published very little. In the latest edition of his works, printed at Florence in 1878, there are only a few 'Poesie Volanti' added to the collection of poems published in 1867.

Among these 'Poesie' were a few stanzas upon an iron bedstead, which he desired his old nurse, to whom he was much attached and who lived with him to the last, to place in his room at Verona. The couplets described the bed as made of the same 'metal temprato, onde si fan le spade,' &c; but the last verse was prophetic. It ran thus:—

'E alfin verrà quel dì, che tra le bianche
Tue coltri, o letto, ove morir desio,
Placidamente le pupille stanche
Io chiudirò, per riaprirle in Dio.'[2]

And so it came to pass exactly as it is described in these lines.

One night (July 18, 1878) he lay down to rest on this bed, which has now become historical, apparently in perfect health, but in the night, death came upon him without his being aware of that awful presence, and he passed away in his sleep.

[1] 'Soleva Roma, ch 'l buon mondo feo,
Duo Soli aver, che l'una e l'altra strada
Facean vedere, e del mondo e di Deo.'—*Purg.* xvi.

See also the admirable paper in the *Rivista Europea*, 1878-9, entitled 'Leone XIII. e la Civiltà,' vol. xi. fasc. i. and ii.

[2] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi*, ed. 1878, p. 400. This edition contains a fac-simile of these couplets in the poet's own handwriting. They were translated into German for Prince Bismarck.—*Epistolario*, p. 300.

Digitized by Google

No end could have been more blessed, more peaceful, more entirely to be envied. After a life of toil and anxiety, many hardships, much suffering in the cause he loved, he lived to see the desire of his heart fulfilled, and died in his own home in his native city, Verona, and surrounded by those he loved. The countenance was so perfectly calm and placid, almost with a smile on the lips, that, when the faithful nurse came to rouse him in the morning, it was long before she could be persuaded that he had entered upon the dawn 'di più sereno dì' than any which could have awaited him in this world.

When, on the following day, the coffin which contained all that remained of her beloved 'bambino' was borne to the grave, the poor faithful creature watched it from the window till it was out of sight: then her heart broke and she fell senseless to the ground.[1]

All Italy mourned the death of her patriotic poet, and all the city of Verona followed him to the grave.

An elaborate oration was pronounced over his coffin before it was lowered into its final resting-place. We do not know what were the terms of praise or criticism which were bestowed on the departed poet on that occasion, but we do know what he wished to have said when that moment came:—

'Oh mi sia dato
Tanto di vita e di quest' arte mia
Che un dì si possa dir *sul mio feretro*,
Ella fe batter nobilmente il core
Di santi sdegni e confortò di speme
La mesta gioventù della sua terra.'[2]

The love of poetry and the love of his country were the twin passions of Aleardi's soul, and it was his constant endeavour to make the first subservient to the second. Yet he says himself—

'I saw that by so doing I should circumscribe the flight of my Muse and pluck many a feather from her pinions. Still my country had the paramount claim. I was proud of my nationality, and I had a sure presentiment that, one day, Italy would be free, that meanwhile it was a sacred duty to devote my poetical gifts, such as they were, to her cause. Much of my poetry was written under the watchful suspicious eyes of a foreign administration, with a vista in the background of some Illyrian, Hungarian, or Bohemian prison awaiting me. Therefore my ideas were many of them nipped in the bud, some were thrown out in the shape of a suggestion, some as outlines without my being able to add the colour or shade which would have given them more evident life. And these restrictions ill become an

[1] *Prampolini*, pp. 3, 4. [2] *Aleardo Aleardi*, p. 61.

Digitized by Google

art which should be as free and unfettered as the soul. Hence many obscurities, a somewhat artificial style, often disconnected and vague, defects which will instantly strike the reader. . . . . For this reason I feel that my poems will have but a fleeting popularity, and that if I were to return to earth after the lapse of a hundred years, I should find myself and them as clean forgotten as "Fra Felice," on his return from the wood where he had been listening to the enchanting song of the bird, heedless of the flight of time.'

So frank and fearless an avowal of faults on the part of the poet himself must disarm any harsher criticism and leave us free to dwell with unmixed pleasure upon the succession of new and beautiful ideas supplied from the inexhaustible treasures of his imagination, and upon his power of rendering them in language and rhythm described as 'Aleardesque' by his native critics. Nor was this descriptive art, in which he was so great a master, confined to the scenes of varied beauty among which, as an Italian, his lot was cast. We find it again in the faithful delineation of the equally variable passions and affections of the human soul. 'I have written,' he tells us, 'more with the heart than with the mind,' and here we have the secret of the strange fascination of his poems, scarcely to be accounted for by their literary merit taken in the abstract. 'Heart speaks to heart,' and Aleardi, out of the overflowing of his love for his country and his compassion for all suffering humanity,[1] strikes so sympathetic a chord that the heart must indeed be cold and dead which cannot vibrate in answer: more especially when touched by one intimately acquainted with those delicate shades of feeling, those depths of passionate tenderness, to which only those who have suffered possess the clue.

This kind of poetry may not perhaps entitle Aleardi to the position of '*Cinque* Poeta Italiano,' to which, in the first burst of their enthusiasm, he was elected by his grateful countrymen. Nor can the rhythm of his blank verse, however smooth and faultless, be considered anything but a poor exchange for the vigorous *terza rima*, or the rolling stanzas, of the fathers of Italian poetry. Still it marks a new capability of the beautiful plastic language; it served a great purpose, and must on these accounts claim an honoured place in the beadroll of his country's literature. His writings in prose show the same fervent imagination, the same originality of thought and expression, to which his verses owe so much

[1] 'Pietà di tutto cui quaggiù castiga
La inevitabil legge del dolore.'—
Canti di Aleardo Aleardi, p. 121.

Digitized by Google

of their charm. In his *Epistolario*[1] we read with interest his brilliant letters to such correspondents as Giulio Carcano, Cesare Cantù, and the famous living historian, Pasquale Villari, who revised several of Aleardi's poems by his special request.[2]

Aleardi has yet another claim to the gratitude of posterity in having refused to become the disciple of a School of Italian poetry at that time prevalent in Italy, which reached its climax in Leopardi; a school whose maxim was despair. To Leopardi the world was covered with a dark pall. It was vain to hope for any improvement from society, rotten at the core, or from a nation sunk in slavish apathy and indifference. And if the present life was dark, that of the future appeared dim and clouded to his faint and wavering faith.

Aleardi would have nothing to do with this faithless discouragement. Often baffled, he returned again to the charge; again and again he revived the people's courage when crushed by defeat; no public disasters could destroy his confident hope in the future restoration of his country, just as no personal hardship could quench the enthusiasm of his soul.

His faith remained clear and bright as the polestar to guide him safe through the journey of life, which he describes in one of his most original metaphors:—

'Iddio connesse
In un mistico nodo anima e polve,
Come cavallo e cavalier, li avvia
A le venture d'una corsa istessa.
E perenne è la lotta, e le cadute
Vituperose, e splendidi i trionfi.
Con la valida voce ora i galoppi
Domina il sire; con obliqui slanci
Ora il cavallo il cavalier trascina.
Passan, così congiunti, profumate
Curve di colli e selve paurose,
Squallidi stagni e fruttuosi piani,
Fino a quel dì, che estenuato esangue
Cade il corsier; e del nitrito estremo
Fa il portico sonar d'un cimitero.'

'God hath knit
The soul and body in one mystic bond,
As horse and rider, and then sent them forth
To run their course upon the race of life.
Along the way the strife is permanent.
And now the rider with decided voice
The steed controls, and now with sudden swerve

[1] Published at Verona in 1879.

[2] *Epistolario*, p. 176

Digitized by Google

The horse has thrown his burden in the dust.
Yet joined together onwards still they pass
O'er gently swelling slope, through forest dark,
Flying o'er dreary marsh and pleasant plain;
Until, at last, one day the charger falls,
Worn out, his strength all spent. The hollow tomb
Gives back the echo of his dying groan.'

And therefore we feel that we may safely leave him at that moment when—

'Libero il cavalier si leva
Affacciandosi a Dio, che le cadute
E le vittorie numera.'[1]

ART. III.—THE LITURGY AND RITUAL OF THE CELTIC CHURCH.

1. *De ecclesiasticis Britonum Scotorumque fontibus.* By C. G. SCHOELL. (Berlin, 1851.)
2. *Irische Kanonensammlung.* By F. W. H. WASSERSCHLEBEN. (Giessen, 1874.)
3. *Celtic Scotland.* By W. F. SKENE. (Edinburgh, 1876.)
4. *Adamnani Vita S. Columbæ.* By W. REEVES. (Dublin, 1857.)

THE Church of England has been witnessing during the course of the last quarter of a century, and is witnessing still, the gradual reception by her members of certain liturgical doctrines, and the gradually revived use of certain points of liturgical ritual, which had fallen for many years into partial or complete oblivion and disuse.

We may mention in exemplification of this statement such matters of doctrine or practice as are involved in (*a*) Eucharistic commemoration of the departed, (*b*) the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, (*c*) fasting reception of Holy Communion, (*d*) the eastward position of the celebrant, (*e*) the use of a special Eucharistic vestment, (*f*) the use of altar-lights, (*g*) the use of the mixed chalice, (*h*) the use of unleavened wafer-bread, (*i*) the use of incense, &c.

This is by no means an exhaustive list, but it sums up

[1] *Canti di Aleardo Aleardi: Lettere a Maria*, p. 169.

Digitized by Google

some of the most prominent points about which there has been lately much eager and heated controversy. For it was not to be expected that a revival of such usages could be effected with unanimity or without challenge. They have been denounced in high quarters as (1) not permitted by the Book of Common Prayer, and as being therefore violations of the Act of Uniformity, and illegal. They were and are more popularly denounced as (2) new-fangled, or as (3) Roman Catholic.

With regard to the question of the technical illegality of some of these points, as established by a recent decision of the highest civil law-court of this realm, we content ourselves here with this one observation. The decision was avowedly based on the principle that omission is prohibition. This offers a very insecure ground for the Puritanical opponents of ritual to take their stand upon, and it will be a suicidal policy for them to adopt it. If sound, it is quite as fatal to the collect interpolated before the sermon, and to the black gown in the pulpit, as it can be to the 'Agnus Dei' before Communion, and to the chasuble at the altar. If rigidly carried out, it reduces Anglican ritual to more bald and meagre proportions than that of any other Church in Christendom. But what is meant by the more popular indictments of novelty and Romanism? In what sense are such ritual observances as the eastward position or the mixed chalice 'new'? If it is meant that they have been temporarily disused in this or that locality, and that their reintroduction is a novelty to the present generation of worshippers in this or that spot, the accuracy of the impeachment must be admitted. If it is meant that they are new in the sense of being a new-fangled invention of Anglican ritualists in the nineteenth century, the charge must be denied not only as being untrue, but as being the exact reverse of the truth, for it can be proved from history that they have the whole weight of Christian antiquity in their favour. Again, what is meant by the charge of Romanizing? If it is meant that the eastward position and the mixed chalice are found in use in the Church of Rome, the charge must be admitted: but the same charge is equally true of the observance of Sunday, or of the use of the *Te Deum* in divine service. If it is meant that their use is exclusively Roman, that is to say, unknown to Catholic antiquity, as is the case with communion in one kind, then the charge is capable of historical disproof, and must be labelled as absolutely untrue.

In order to substantiate these positions, and to prove the

Digitized by Google

antiquity of these ritual usages from a *national* point of view, we have collected together in the following pages some information about the Liturgy and altar ceremonial of the earliest Christian Church in Great Britain and Ireland. We must not be tempted here to enter into the history or to draw a complete picture of that Church, nor will we take up space by an enumeration of all the sources from which our facts are derived, or by a discussion of their relative value and importance. Those sources will be briefly indicated by the aid of references and footnotes. Yet with regard to the ancient Celtic Church, as it existed in this kingdom before and after the arrival of S. Augustine's Mission, these few broad facts must be borne in the reader's mind.

It was a Church independent, as to its origin, of the See of Rome, exhibiting traces of an Ephesine rather than of a Petrine affinity. Its saints and bishops were either ignorant of the claims of Rome, or, when they came in contact with them, hostile to them, as in the case of S. Columbanus in his correspondence with Boniface IV., and of the British bishops in their conference with S. Augustine at the oak. It was a Church of an almost exclusively monastic character, possessing few secular clergy; of vast missionary enterprise, touching Iceland to the north, Spain to the south, Austria to the east, with its missions; of undisputed orthodoxy, many of its martyrs and confessors having from earliest times found an unquestioned place in the common calendar of Catholic Christendom.

Such having been the character of the earliest Christian Church in these islands, we proceed to place before the reader what information we can glean from various quarters of its Liturgy and Ritual.

1. We infer the prominence of a sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist in the Celtic Church from a bare enumeration of the titles which were applied to it by contemporaneous writers.

The altar service itself was entitled—

Sacrificium. (*Regula S. Columbani*, cap. xii.)
Sacrificale mysterium. (Cuminius, *Vita S. Columbæ*, p. 29.)
Sacra sancti sacrificii mysteria. (*Ib.* p. 32.)

In the vernacular, Comna (*Senchus Mor.* iii. 32, 39); Comain (*Leabhar Breac*, f. 29 b); Oiffrenn (*Senchus Mor.* i. 126); Sacorfaicc (*Book of Deer*); Sacarbaic (*Leabhar Breac*, f. 29 b).

The word 'sacrificium' was used equally for that which

Digitized by Google

...Columbanus. Mabillon, in his *Annals* ... (vol. i. p. 320), gives a full account of ...ections, after several trivial objections ... the following more important one:—

'...clesiorum ritu ac norma desciscerent et sacra ...onum et collectarum multiplici varietate

... disciple and successor of Columbanus in ... Luxovium (Lisieux), admitted the charge, ...ence the general acceptableness of all prayer

...ssible to decide with certainty to what Agrestius ... charge. It may have been to certain volumi... ...ons to, or insertions in, the Canon of the Mass, as ... the Stowe Missal. Benedict XIV., in his work, ... *Missæ Sacrificio*, interprets it of the substitu... ... several collects for the one collect which ordinarily ... the Epistle in the Roman Missal, and which is thus ... to in one of the opening rubrics in the Gregorian ... 'Postmodum dicitur *oratio*, deinde sequitur ...'

Commenting on this rubric, Benedict XIV. said:—

'Unam tantum olim in hac missæ parte collecta seu oratio dice... ...t, ut animadvertit Menardus in notis ad Sacramentarium S. Gregorii. ...rum quendam Columbanum accusavit Agrestinus, quod contra ...cæ morem plures in missa orationes recitaret, quem egregie ...vertit Eustasius,' &c.[2]

But why should not the charge of Agrestius have referred to the existence of other, and to the Roman worshipper unknown, collects, which are found in the Gallican and Moza...rabic Liturgies, and to which the writer of the Latin preface to the latter Liturgy in Migne's edition refers thus?—

'Cum sacerdos in utraque Liturgia (i.e. Gallicana et Mozarabica) populum salutat, et ad altare accedens, septem illas solemnes ora...ones, quibus Liturgiæ Gallicana, Gotho-Hispana et Mozarabica ...que constant, et ab aliis quibuscunque distinguuntur, devote ...ebat, i.e. (i.) Præfatio missæ, (ii.) alia oratio, (iii.) post nomina, (iv.) ad pacem, (v.) Contestatio aut Immolatio Missæ aut Illatio, (vi.) mysterium aut Post pridie, (vii.), Dominica oratio, cui brevis oratio ...mittitur, Ante orationem Dominicam Gallis dicta, et subsequitur alia quæ iisdem Post orationem Dominicam nominatur.'[3]

[1] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 25.
[2] Benedict XIV. *Op.* Edit. MDCCLXVII. tom. viii. p. 33.
[3] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxxv. p. 25.

Digitized by Google

against the Rule of S. Columban. Mabillon, in his *Annals of the Benedictine Order* (vol. i. p. 320), gives a full account of the controversy, and mentions, after several trivial objections brought by Agrestius, the following more important one:—

'In summa quod a cæterorum ritu ac norma desciscerent et sacra missarum sollemnia orationum et collectarum multiplici varietate celebrarent.'

Eustasius, the disciple and successor of Columbanus in the monastery of Luxovium (Lisieux), admitted the charge, but pleaded in defence the general acceptableness of all prayer before God.

It is impossible to decide with certainty to what Agrestius referred in his charge. It may have been to certain voluminous additions to, or insertions in, the Canon of the Mass, as exhibited in the Stowe Missal. Benedict XIV., in his work, *De sacrosancto Missæ Sacrificio*, interprets it of the substitution of several collects for the one collect which ordinarily precedes the Epistle in the Roman Missal, and which is thus referred to in one of the opening rubrics in the Gregorian Sacramentary: 'Postmodum dicitur *oratio*, deinde sequitur Apostolus.'[1]

Commenting on this rubric, Benedict XIV. said:—

'Una tantum olim in hac missæ parte collecta seu oratio dicebatur, ut ostendit Menardus in notis ad Sacramentarium S. Gregorii. Sanctum quondam Columbanum accusavit Agrestinus, quod contra Ecclesiæ morem plures in missa orationes recitaret, quem egregie defendit Eustasius,' &c.[2]

But why should not the charge of Agrestius have referred to the existence of other, and to the Roman worshipper unknown, collects, which are found in the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies, and to which the writer of the Latin preface to the latter Liturgy in Migne's edition refers thus?—

'Tum sacerdos in utraque Liturgia (i.e. Gallicana et Mozarabica) populum salutat, et ad altare accedens, septem illas solemnes orationes, quibus Liturgiæ Gallicana, Gotho-Hispana et Mozarabica precipue constant, et ab aliis quibuscunque distinguuntur, devote recitabat, i.e. (i.) Prefatio missæ, (ii.) alia oratio, (iii.) post nomina, (iv.) ad pacem, (v.) Contestatio aut Immolatio Missæ aut Illatio, (vi.) mysterium aut Post pridie, (vii.), Dominica oratio, cui brevis oratio premittitur, Ante orationem Dominicam Gallis dicta, et subsequitur alia quæ iisdem Post orationem Dominicam nominatur.'[3]

[1] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 25.
[2] Benedicti XIV. *Op.* Edit. MDCCLXVII. tom. viii. p. 33.
[3] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxxv. p. 25.

Digitized by Google

Dr. O'Conor commenting on this point says: 'This multiplicity of prayers is expressly mentioned by Columbanus himself in his Rule, c. 7.'[1] But, on reference to that rule, we find that S. Columban is not speaking of the Liturgy at all, but of petitions in the form of versicles inserted in the day hours of the Divine Office.[2]

The Pater Noster.—The Lord's Prayer formed an essential part of the Celtic as of every other known Liturgy except the Clementine. Heavy penalties were specially enjoined at Iona by the Abbot Cuminius, in case of any mistake in its recitation.[3] But it was not introduced with the unvarying formula of the Roman Canon, in its earliest as well as latest editions: 'Præceptis salutaribus moniti et divina institutione formati audemus dicere;' nor was it followed by the Roman Embolismus, 'Libera nos, quæsumus, Domine,' &c. The varying forms substituted here in the liturgical fragments of the Books of Mulling, Dimma, and Deer are among the strongest proofs of an Ephesine rather than a Petrine origin of the whole Liturgy. The names of local saints were sometimes introduced into the Embolismus, as that of S. Patrick in the Embolismus in the S. Gall MS. 1394, and in the canon of the Stowe Missal.

3. LECTIONS.—Lections are mentioned as having formed part of the Liturgy. The following is among the directions of Abbot Cuminius:—

'Sacrificium non est accipiendum de manu sacerdotis qui orationes et lectiones secundum ritum implere non potest.'[4]

This possibly implies that, in addition to the Epistle and Gospel, there was a third lection, from the Old Testament—Lectio Prophetica—preceding them, as in the Mozarabic and Gallican Liturgies.[5]

Its position in the Gallican service is described by Germanus, Bishop of Paris:—

'Sequebatur lectio ex prophetis et ex apostolo. Nam præter Evangelii lectionem, duas unam ex veteri alteram ex novo Testamento lectiones cantabant, quem ritum videre est apud Gregorium Turonensem [lib. i. *De Mirac. S. Martini*, cap. 5], ubi hæc habet: Factum est ut illa Dominica, prophetica lectione jam lecta, ante altarium staret qui lectionem beati Pauli proferret,' &c.

[1] *Bibl. MS. Stowensis*, vol. i. Appendix i. p. 43.
[2] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxx. p. 212.
[3] Cuminii Abbatis *De Mensura Pœnitentiarum*, c. xiii.
[4] Fleming, *Collect. Sacra*, p. 210.
[5] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxxv. 25.

Digitized by Google

From a passage in Adamnan's *Life of Columba* it appears as if an additional lection from the Gospels preceded the Liturgy itself.[1]

4. PROPER PREFACES.—The use of a Proper Preface for the festival of S. Patrick, 'sollemnitas dormitationis ejus,' is alluded to in Tirechan's annotations (eighth century), but no trace of its wording has survived. In the Book of Armagh it is ordered that on S. Patrick's Day 'offertorium ejus proprium immolari.' This probably means that commemoration of S. Patrick should be made during the Liturgy in a special preface, for which the Gallican name was 'Immolatio Missæ.' A portion of a Proper Preface for the Circumcision survives in the ninth century MS. fragment of an ancient Irish Missal in the Liturgy of S. Gall, No. 1394.—(Stowe Missal, f. 22 b.)

5. BENEDICTION.—The Benediction was given with the right hand and in the Eastern manner. That is to say, the first, second, and fourth fingers were extended, and the third was closed down upon the extremity of the thumb over the palm of the hand. This may be seen in the representation of S. Matthew in the Book of Kells[2] (sixth century); of our Lord in glory in an Irish MS. of the Four Gospels at S. Gall[3] (ninth century); of S. Matthew surmounted by an angel in the Golden Gospels of Stockholm, of composite sixth-century Celtic and eighth or ninth century Anglo-Saxon work.[4] There are also traces of the early use of the Roman mode of benediction. The thumb, middle and forefinger are extended, and the third and fourth fingers are bent, in the case of figures sculptured in the attitude of blessing on the ancient Ruthwell stone with Runic inscriptions,[5] on an Iona cross,[6] and on a tenth-century cross at Oronsay.[7]

With regard to the place of the episcopal benediction in the Liturgy, Dr. Döllinger[8] concludes that it was given after the consecration and fraction, and before the immission of the consecrated particle into the chalice. This is an inference from the language in which the celebration of the Eucharist by Bishop Cronan at Iona is described by Adamnan.[9] It occupied a similar position in the ancient Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies.[10] The same position was assigned

[1] Adamnan, *Vit. S. Columbæ*, iii. 23.
[2] Westwood, *Miniatures of Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS.*, plate x.
[3] *Ib.* plate xxvii. [4] *Ib.* plate i.
[5] Stuart, *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. ii. pl. xx.
[6] *Ib.* pl. xxvi. [7] *Ib.* pl. i.
[8] *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 183.
[9] Lib. i. cap. 44. [10] Hammond, *Ancient Liturgies*, p. xxviii.

Digitized by Google

to it afterwards in the Anglo-Saxon Church,[1] and was perpetuated in the Sarum Use up to the first vernacular Prayer-book of 1549, and in the mediæval French Uses of Paris, Arles, Lyons, Rouen, Clermont, Angers, Tours, &c.[2] Dr. Rock argues thus for the Gallican origin of this liturgical feature:—

'That such episcopal blessings formed a part of the old liturgy long before Pope Gregory and S. Austin's days, we learn from the fact that S. Cæsarius of Arles, who lived almost a whole century before those apostles of our Anglo-Saxon fathers, speaks of this rite as of a thing practised everywhere about him. Knowing, then, as we do, from the formal and public visit made to the Church in this island by SS. Germanus and Lupus, how the British and Gallic Churches were knit together, not only by the feelings of religious friendship, but by the oneness of true belief, we are warranted in thinking that a ceremonial then in common use throughout a neighbouring country, with which this land kept up such an intimate connexion in matters of faith, must have been common, too, here; so that our bishops among the Britons, like their brethren beyond the sea in Gaul, used to bestow their episcopal blessing at this part of the holy sacrifice.'[3]

6. THE PAX.—The kiss of peace was given after the prayer of consecration, and before the communion of the people, the priest saying these words as he gave the pax:—

'Pax et charitas Domini et communicatio sanctorum omnium sit semper vobiscum.'

To which the people responded—

'Et cum spiritu tuo.'

And then was sung—

'Pacem meam do vobis; pacem meam relinquo vobis. Alleluia.'[4]

Or, according to the formula in the Stowe Missal—

'Pacem mandasti, pacem dedisti, pacem dereliquisti, pacem tuam, Domine, da nobis de celo, et pacificum hunc diem et ceteros dies vitæ nostræ in tua pace disponas, per Dominum.'

After the fraction and the 'Agnus Dei':—

'Pacem meam do vobis. Alleluia. Pacem relinquo vobis. Alleluia. Pax multa diligentibus legem tuam, Domine. Alleluia.'

[1] Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, i. 295.
[2] De Moléon, *Voyages Liturgiques*, pp. 246, 322, &c.
[3] *Church of our Fathers*, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 40.
[4] S. Gall MSS. No. 1394. *Report on Fœdera*, App. A, p. 95. This is the Roman, not the Gallican, position of the pax.

Digitized by Google

Exclusion from communion and from the kiss of peace was the punishment for certain offences in the Welsh Church, A.D. 570.[1]

7. PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.—To pray for the dead was a recognized custom in the ancient Celtic, as in every other portion of the primitive Church. The following words are inscribed in Hiberno-Saxon characters on a stone cross at Gwnnws, in Cardiganshire :—

'Quicunque explicaverit hoc nomen det benedixionem pro anima Hiroidil filius Carotinn.'[2]

And on a stone in the ruins of Caldey Priory, Pembrokeshire, in letters assigned by Professor Westwood to a date soon after the departure of the Romans from these islands :—

'Et signo crucis in illum finxi. Rogo omnibus ammulantibus ibi ut exorent pro anima Catuoconi.'[3]

Other ancient inscriptions of similar tenor have been found in various parts of Ireland, Scotland, and Cornwall.[4] So in the case of manuscripts. Celtic writers would end their volumes by requesting the prayers of their hereafter readers. On the fly-leaf of the *Book of Durrow*, or Gospels of S. Columba, in the library of Trinity College, Dublin (sixth century), there is this entry :—

'Rogo beatitudinem tuam, sancte presbyter patriæ, ut quicunque hunc libellum manu tenuerit meminerit Columbæ scriptoris, qui hoc scripsi ipsemet evangelium per xii dierum spatium gratia Domini nostri.'

A little lower, in a contemporary hand :—

'Ora pro me, frater ; Dominus tecum sit.'

Adamnan ended his tract, *De Locis sanctis* (seventh century), with these words :—

'Obsecro itaque eos quicunque breves legerint libellos ut pro eodem sancto sacerdote Arculfo divinam precentur clementiam, qui hæc de sanctis experimenta locis eorum frequentator libentissime nobis dictavit. Quæ et ego quamlibet inter laboriosas et prope insustentabiles tota die undique conglobatas ecclesiasticas sollicitudines constitutus vili quamvis sermone describens declaravi. Horum

[1] Gildæ, *Præfat. de Penitentia.*
[2] *Archæologia Cambrensis*, 4th series, vol. v. p. 245.
[3] *Ib.* vol. i. p. 139.
[4] Facsimiles of these may be seen in Hübner, Æmilius, *Inscriptiones Britannicæ Christianæ*, pp. 33, 75, &c. *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, vol. i. pp. 85, 86. Lord Dunraven, *Notes on Irish Architecture*, pp. 48, 58, 88, 89. Petrie, G., *Christian Inscriptions in the Irish Language.*

Digitized by Google

ergo lectorem admone experimentorum ut pro me misello peccatore eorundem craxatore Christum judicem seculorum exorare non negleget.'

The colophon at the end of the *Book of Mac Regol* (eighth century) runs thus:—

'Quicunque legerit et intellegerit istam narrationem orat pro Mac Reguil scriptori.'

In the fifth century it was customary in Ireland to offer the Eucharist on behalf of the departed. In one of the Canons of the Synod of S. Patrick, the question is asked how the sacrifice could be expected to benefit a person after death who had not received it during his lifetime.[1] In the sixth century the monks at Iona were enjoined 'fervour in singing the office for the dead, as if every one of the faithful departed was a particular friend,'[2] and the Eucharist was offered on the day of the funeral, and on the third and seventh days afterwards.[3] In the seventh century, when S. Gall was informed of the death of Columbanus, he forthwith gave orders for preparations to be made to enable him to offer the sacrifice of salvation for the repose of the departed Saint,[4] and a like kind office was performed on behalf of S. Gall by a surviving episcopal friend.[5]

Prayer for the repose of the dead being thus a general custom, and the commemoration of the departed being one aspect and object of the Eucharist, it naturally occupied a recognized position in the Liturgy. Diptychs containing the names of the deceased were brought by the deacon to the celebrant, and their contents were announced by him during the offertory, after the first oblation of the unconsecrated elements, and before the Canon. A special penance was assigned at Iona to the deacon who forgot this part of his duty.[6] This recitation of names was followed by an anthem in an authorized form of words, called the *Deprecatio.* It contained an enumeration of the names of those departed saints for whose repose the prayers of the congregation were requested, and of those by whose intercessions such prayers would be assisted. We know that at Iona it ended with the name of S. Martin, and that on one occasion S. Columba, celebrating on the day following his reception of the news of

[1] Cap. xii.
[2] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils, &c.* ii. i. 118.
[3] Fleming, *Collect. Sacra*, p. 210.
[4] Walafrid Strabo, *Vita B. Galli*, i. 26.
[5] *Ib.* i. 30.
[6] Cuminius, *De Mensura Pœniten.* cap. xiii.

Digitized by Google

the death of Columbanus, suddenly turned to the cantors, and bade them add his name to the *deprecatio*. The words of Adamnan in narrating this incident are these :—

'Sed forte dum inter talia cum modulatione officia illa consueta decantaretur *deprecatio*, in qua sancti Martini commemoratur nomen, subito Sanctus (Columba) ad cantores ejusdem onomatis ad locum pervenientes, Hodie, ait, pro sancto Columbano episcopo decantare debetis. Tunc omnes qui inerant fratres intellexerunt quod Columbanus, episcopus Lagenensis (=Leinster), carus Columbæ amicus ad Dominum emigraverit.'[1]

This passage affords a strong presumption in favour of the identity of the Celtic and Gallican Liturgies. In the latter, the priest after presenting the oblations on the altar, and praying for the illapse of the Holy Ghost, recited from the diptychs the names of saints, both quick and dead, in whose memory or for whom the offering was made. The liturgical formula in use for this purpose in the Church of Arles, in the sixth century, has been preserved, and in spite of its length is here subjoined in full, as being probably identical with the form of words which constituted the *deprecatio* in the Celtic Liturgy at Iona :—

'Simulque *precantes* oramus etiam, Domine, pro animabus famulorum tuorum Patrum atque institutorum quondam nostrorum, Aureliani, Petri, Florentini, Redempti, Constantini, Himiteri, Hilarini, Januarini, Reparati, Childeberti, Ultrogothæ, vel omnium fratrum nostrorum quos de hoc loco ad te vocare dignatus es. Cunctorumque etiam hujus loci memores fidelium, pariterque parentum nostrorum, atque servientium hujus loci, et pro animabus omnium fidelium famulorum tuorum, vel famularum, ac peregrinorum in pace ecclesiæ defunctorum, ut eis tu, Domine Deus noster, peccatorum tribuas veniam et requiem largiaris eternam ; meritis et intercessionibus sanctorum tuorum, Mariæ genitricis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Joannis Baptistæ et precursoris Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Stephani, Petri, Pauli, Joannis, Jacobi, Andreæ, Philippi, Thomæ, Bartholomæi, Matthæi, Jacobi, Simonis, Judæ, Mathiæ, Genesii, Symphoriani, Baudilii, Victoris, Hilarii episcopi et confessoris, *Martini* episcopi et confessoris, Cæsarii episcopi, hæc propitius præstare et exaudire digneris, qui vivis et regnas in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.'[2]

The first group of names in this *deprecatio* consists of fathers and founders of the Church of Arles ; the second

[1] Adamnan, *Vit. S. Columbæ*, iii. 12, with Dr. Reeves' valuable note.
[2] Regula S. Aureliani (Bishop of Arles, d. 551). Mabillon, *De Liturg. Gallic.* lib. i. c. v. sect. 12. This section is extracted nearly verbatim from Reeves' edit. of Adamnan, p. 107, n. 2.

Digitized by Google

group consists of fifteen names of Holy Scripture, followed by certain leading Gallican saints, of whom the last-named, Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles, died A.D. 542. His name, which appears here on account of a local relation, would probably have been omitted at Iona, and so the name of S. Martin, which was held in special veneration in these islands, would be the last in the list, until, on the occasion referred to by Adamnan, S. Columba ordered the name of Columbanus to be added to it.

This position of the commemoration of the living and the dead survives in the English Liturgy, while in the Roman Mass it occupies a different place, being within and a portion of the Canon itself.

8. THE CANON.—The original Celtic formula of consecration, like the Gallican, is unfortunately lost beyond all hope of recovery. But portions of it, interwoven with parts of the Gelasian Canon, are found in the Stowe Missal (sixth and ninth centuries), and in the fragment of a Scotic Sacramentary at S. Gall (MSS. No. 1394). From allusions to it we infer that it was pronounced in an audible voice,[1] and that the fraction of the host formed an integral portion of its ritual.[2]

The presence of the words of consecration is sometimes indicated in Celtic MSS., as in surviving Gallican fragments, by the opening words 'Qui pridie.'[3] The Celtic canon seems to have been short, like the ancient Gallican canon, and, as in the case of the latter, its introductory clauses up to 'Qui pridie' seem to have varied with each festival. If this be so, we are able to reconstruct the canon of the Celtic Liturgy, as said on Saints' Days, in the following form: taking the opening words 'Vere——pridie' from the Stowe Missal (fol. 41 b), and the remainder from the eighth and ninth cent. Gallican work, known under the title of Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, lib. iv. c. 5:—

'Vere sanctus, vere benedictus, vere mirabilis in sanctis tuis, Dominus noster Jesus Christus ipse dabit virtutem et fortitudinem plebi suæ; benedictus Deus quem benedicimus in Apostolis et in omnibus Sanctis suis, qui placuerunt ei ab initio sæculi per eundem Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.

'Qui pridie quam pateretur in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem; respexit in cœlum ad te, sancte Pater, omnipotens æterne

[1] Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, i. 40. [2] *Ib.* i. 44.

[3] Stowe Missal, fol. 41 b; and photograph of an eighth-century Gallican fragment, recently discovered by the Rev. H. B. Swete attached to one of the covers of a Gonville and Caius College MS., No. 153.

Digitized by Google

Deus, gratias agens benedixit, fregit, fractumque Apostolis suis et Discipulis suis tradidit, dicens: Accipite, et edite ex hoc omnes, hoc est enim corpus meum quod pro multis confringetur.

'Similiter etiam calicem, postquam cœnatum est, pridie quam pateretur, accepit, respexit in cœlum ad te, sancte Pater, omnipotens æterne Deus, gratias agens benedixit, Apostolis suis et Discipulis suis tradidit, dicens: Accipite, et bibite ex hoc omnes, hic est enim sanguis meus.'

9. COMMUNION HYMN.—In the ancient Irish Church a hymn was sung after the prayer of consecration, during the communion of the clergy, and before that of the people. In the preface to the *Leabhar Breac*, which Irish scholars, judging by its language and style, have assigned to the seventh or eighth century, there is a legend which speaks of a choir of angels being heard in the church of S. Sechnall, chanting the hymn 'Sancti venite,' &c., which hymn, the writer adds, has been sung in the Irish Church during Communion. No trace of such a hymn has been found in any Breviaries or Antiphonaries more modern than the 'Antiphonarium Benchorense' (seventh century), where it is entitled 'Hymnus quando communicarent sacerdotes:'—

'Sancti venite,
Christi corpus sumite,
Sanctum bibentes
Quo redempti sanguinem,' &c.[1]

During the communion of the people the following anthem was sung. It is taken, together with its rubric, from the fragment of an Irish Missal at S. Gall (No. 1394), and is found in almost the same form in the Stowe Missal:—

'*Et mittit sacerdos sancta in calicem, et dat sibi populus pacem, atque communicant, et juxta communionem canitur.*

'Pacem meam do vobis, pacem meam relinquo vobis. Alleluia. Dominus reget me. Qui manducat corpus meum et bibit meum sanguinem, alleluia, ipse in me manet et ego in illo. Alleluia. Hic est panis vivus qui de cælo descendit. Alleluia. Qui manducat hunc panem vivet in æternum. Alleluia. Ad te, Domine, levavi. Venite, comedite panem meum et bibite vinum quod miscui vobis. Judica me, Domine, quoniam ego. Comedite amici. . . . Et nolite eos prohibere. Alleluia. Talium est enim regnum cælorum. Alleluia. Et violenti rapiunt illud. Alleluia. Penitentiam agite. Alleluia. Adpropinquat regnum cælorum. Alleluia. Hoc sacrum corpus Domini et Salvatoris sanguinem, alleluia, sumite vobis in vitam æternam. Alleluia. In labiis meis meditabor. Alleluia. Cum docueris me

[1] *Liber Hymnorum*, p. 44. The eleven stanzas of this hymn are familiar in Neale's English translation, 'Draw nigh and take the body of the Lord.'

Digitized by Google

justitias, et ego justitias respondebo. Alleluia. Venite, benedicti Patris mei, possidete regnum, alleluia, quod vobis paratum est ab origine mundi. Alleluia. Ubi ego fuero, illic erit et minister meus. Alleluia.

These anthems occupied a position corresponding to that of the 'Transitorium' in the Ambrosian, the 'Trecanum' in the Gallican, the anthem 'Gustate et videte' in the Mozarabic, the 'Communio' in the Roman rite.

10. THE BENEDICITE.—The 'Song of the Three Children' appears in various forms, and occupies a prominent position in the Antiphonary of Bangor, from which fact we infer that this canticle, with its antiphons, formed a constituent part of the Celtic, as it did of the Gallican[1] and Mozarabic[2] Liturgies, where it was sung before the Epistle and Gospel on all Sundays and Saints' Days.

We now pass on from the Liturgy itself to some account of its ritual accessories.

11. POSITION AND ATTITUDE OF THE CELEBRANT.—The position of the priest was before the altar, that is to say, facing the altar and with his back to the congregation. This is an inference from the language used by Cuminius, when describing four brothers watching S. Columba celebrate at Iona, and seeing a strange light streaming down upon his head.[3] Gildas, speaking of the degenerate character of the British priesthood, speaks of them as 'seldom sacrificing, and never with clean heart standing at the altar.'[4] He also makes mention of extended hands as part of the ritual of the Mass, speaking of British priests as 'extending their hands over the holy sacrifice,'[5] an expression which finds a counterpart in various phrases in the more modern rubrics of both the Anglican and Roman Liturgies.[6]

12. VESTMENTS.—Special vestments were in use at the altar. It is recorded among the instances of the generosity of S. Bridget, that 'she gave away the transmarine and foreign vestments of Bishop Condlaedh, of glorious light, which he was accustomed to use when offering the holy mysteries at the altars on the festivals of our Lord and the vigils of the Apostles.'[7] Adamnan speaks of 'the vestments and books of

[1] Germani Paris. *Expos. brevis Antiq. Lit. Gall.* sect. vii.

[2] IV. Concil. Tolet. A.D. 633, can. 14.

[3] 'De vertice sancti Columbæ *ante altare stantis* et sacram oblationem consecrantis.'—Cuminius, *Vit. S. Columbæ*, c. xii.

[4] Gildas, *Epist.* sect. 66. [5] *Ib.* sect. 67.

[6] 'Extensis manibus prosequitur,' *Roman.* 'Deinde sacerdos elevet brachia sua in modum crucis,' *Sarum.* 'And here to lay his hand upon every vessel,' *Angl.* [7] Cogitosus, *Vita S. Brigidæ*, cap. 29.

Digitized by Google

S. Columba being placed on the altar.'[1] Among the sacerdotal or episcopal articles of attire and ornament alluded to in these and similar passages, and in use in primitive times, we have proof of the existence of the following:—

(*a*) *The chasuble.*—This vestment, in its full circular shape, with embroidered orphreys, is represented on certain figures wrought on the shrine of S. Moedoc[2] (eighth century), on evangelists depicted in the *Book of Deer*,[3] and on figures of priests sculptured on the very ancient Kirriemuir stones in Scotland.[4] Two of these priests hold books; the third has no book, but a Δ-shaped ornament on the lower front part of his dress, just above the feet. Several of them have in front of them a rectangular ornament, which is possibly (*b*) *the rationale*, an ancient but little known ornament of Celtic bishops, which, according to Dr. Rock, is never found in Anglo-Saxon times, but which reappeared among the episcopal ornaments in Anglo-Norman days, and dropped entirely out of use in the fourteenth century. It was fashioned in various shapes, at one time round, at another a trefoil or quatrefoil, but more generally an oblong square. It was made of gold or silver, studded with precious stones, and was worn in imitation of the rational of the Aaronic priesthood, from which it took its name.[5] Another example of it may be seen on a figure of S. Gall in the Golden Psalter.[6] It corresponds to the Greek Peristethion, an oblong plate of jewelled gold or silver worn over the chasuble by patriarchs and metropolitans in the Eastern Church. The figures above referred to on S. Moedoc's shrine, and others on the Soiscel Molaise (p. 26), are also vested in (*c*) *albs*, with embroidered borders (apparels) under their chasubles.[7]

(*d*) *The maniple* was worn, not on the wrist, but over and depending from the forefinger of the left hand, as in the case of the figure of S. Gall in the Golden Psalter. This mode of wearing it was continued till later times, as may be seen by the vested figure worked on S. Cuthbert's stole at Durham, and proved by the inscription on it to have been embroidered by Queen Ælffled, wife of Edward the Elder, A.D. 905, 6.

(*c*) *A ring* of gold, ornamented with sapphires, was on S.

[1] *Vit. S. Columbæ*, ii. 45.
[2] *Archæologia*, xliii. 140. [3] Westwood, *Facsimiles, &c.* plate li.
[4] Stuart, J., *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. i. pl. xliii.
[5] Rock, *Church of our Fathers*, i. 369. Gerbertus, *Vet. Liturg. Aleman.* i. 261.
[6] Westwood, J. O., *Unpublished Drawings.* But this may possibly be a book.
[7] *Archæologia*, xliii. plates xviii., xx.

Digitized by Google

Cuthbert's finger when his body was exhumed in the reign of Henry VIII. There was a ring in the tomb of Ebregesilus, Bishop of Meaux, a monk of the Columban school, when it was opened in the seventh century.[1] There is still earlier evidence of the use of the episcopal ring in Gaul, which is a presumption in favour of its use among contemporaneous British bishops. Clovis I., writing to the Gallican bishops, A.D. 510, promised to pay every attention to their letters, provided that they sealed them with the seals of their pastoral rings.[2] Avitus, Bishop of Vienne (c. 524), writing to Apollinaris, Bishop of Valence, requested that his monogram might be engraved on his ring.[3]

We learn from the writings of S. Gregory of Tours, that (*f*) *pectoral crosses* were worn by Gallican bishops in the sixth century;[4] and the inference that they were introduced thence into the Celtic Church is supported by the preservation of the pectoral cross of S. Aidan, a monk of Iona, and first Bishop of Lindisfarne (A.D. 635–652), among the relics of Durham in the fourteenth century;[5] while that of S. Cuthbert is there now.

There is varied evidence for the early use of the (*g*) *pastoral staff* as an ornament and emblem of authority borne by bishops. Its Celtic name was Cambutta, Cambota, or more rarely Cambo.[6] S. Patrick's staff is alluded to in a seventh-century Irish prophecy, preserved by the scholiast on Fiacc's hymn;[7] and later authority asserts that it was made of gold and adorned with precious stones.[8] His disciples, S. Dagæus and S. Asic, were traditionally famous for their skill in gilding and bejewelling pastoral staves and other ecclesiastical ornaments.[9] S. Columba is said to have made many crosses, book-satchels (polaires), and croziers.[10] When he and S. Kentigern met they exchanged staves, and S. Kentigern's staff, as given to him by S. Columba, covered with gold and jewels, was still preserved at Ripon in the beginning

[1] Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.* i. 456.
[2] *Nouveau Traité de Diplom.* iv. 318. [3] *Epist.* 78.
[4] Greg. Tur. *De Gloria Martyrum*, lib. i. c. 2.
[5] Raine, *S. Cuthbert*, p. 9.
[6] Walafrid Strabo, *Vit. S. Galli*, i. 26. Fleming, *Collectan.* p. 243. In Durandus, *Rationale*, vi. 24, it has become modified into Sambuca. According to Du Cange it is an Armoric word; but how in that case can its use be accounted for in a rubric in the Gregorian Sacramentary? Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. p. 153.
[7] Todd, J. H., *Life of S. Patrick*, p. 411.
[8] Bernardi S. *De Vita Malachiæ*, c. 8.
[9] Ancient Irish Life of S. Columba in the *Leabhar Breac*, translated in Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, vol. ii. App. p. 488. [10] Acta SS. in *Vita Dagæi.*

Digitized by Google

of the fifteenth century.[1] In the tenth century it was held in great veneration, and was carried as a standard in going to battle, under the name of 'Cathbhuaidh'[2] (=Battle Victory). In its original shape the episcopal staff was short, rounded at the top, truncated at the bottom, and made of wood. A specimen may be seen in the hands of one of the figures engraved on the ancient Irish shrine of S. Moedoc of Ferns.[3] Another may be seen in the hands of an ecclesiastic vested in an embroidered chasuble, engraved on the Soiscel Molaise, a small case of tenth-century work at the latest, which once contained a now lost copy of the Gospels, written in the sixth century by S. Molaise of Devenish. It is fair to add that it rather resembles an aspersory than a pastoral staff,[4] in which case it might be appealed to as evidence for the early use of holy water; and the small circular vessel, like a pome, held by another figure, might be a holy-water stoup;[5] but the smallness of the vessel and the largeness of the staff seem fatal to this explanation. It is not unlike a choral ruler's staff.[6] But on the whole we are inclined to infer that it is an early Celtic bishop's pastoral staff, which in the ninth or tenth century began to assume its more modern and now usual form. Other specimens of the primitive cambutta, in its transition size and shape, may be seen in the hands of SS. Matthew and Luke, as depicted in the MS. Gospels of Meiel Brith Mac Durnan (c. A.D. 850),[7] and in those of a figure carved on the cumhdach of the Stowe Missal, metal-work of the eleventh century.[8] The Bachal-More of S. Moloch, in the possession of the Duke of Argyll, figured in the *Origines Parochiales*, ii. 163, is a blackthorn bludgeon, with traces of a metal covering, measuring only two feet eight inches in length. Several of the bronze cambuttas preserved in the museum of the Irish Academy are little longer.

[1] Fordun, *Scatichronicon*, iii. 70.

[2] *Irish Annals*, quoted in Reeves' edit. of Adamnan, p. 333.

[3] S. Moedoc was born A.D. 555, but the shrine is at least a century later.

[4] *Archæologia*, xliii. pl. 20.

[5] *Ib.* pl. 18.

[6] *Liber Landavensis*, c. iii. sect. 1. S. Padarn, who arrived in Wales from Armorica, A.D. 516, had a choral cap and staff presented to him by the people in recognition of his musical talent.

[7] Westwood, *Facsimiles &c.* pl. xxii.

[8] *Ib.* pl. li. fig. 9. Further description and details are given in Stuart's *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, ii. p. lv.; O'Neil, H., *Fine Arts and Civilization of Ireland*, 1853, plates 7, 10, figs. of Kilklispeen and Monasterboice crosses; *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, ix. 51; *Proceedings of the Soc. of Antiq. in Scotland*, vol. ii. pp. 14, 125. An account of Welsh relics, including the staff of S. Cyric and the bell of S. David, &c., is given in the *Welsh Itinerary* of Giraldus Cambrensis, edit. Lond. 1804, pp. 6, 7, 13, 14.

Digitized by Google

It has been suggested that (*h*) *bracelets* or cuffs formed parts of the sacerdotal attire of a British priest. In the absence of documentary or other trustworthy evidence, this is merely an inference from the custom of the early Gallican priesthood to wear metal bracelets or cuffs of silk or other handsome texture.[1]

'If,' says Dr. Rock, 'the ritual observances of our Britons were like those of their nearest neighbour Gaul—and there is every reason for thinking so—then do we, far off as we are from their times, catch a glimpse of another among the sacred appurtenances of a priest in the British era of our Church history; and beholding him vested for the holy sacrifice of the Mass, we shall perceive that along with the fine full chasuble he wore a kind of apparel on the sleeves of his alb. Cuffs of this sort are still found in use among the Greeks, who call them *ἐπιμανίκια*,' &c.[2]

Bracelets have frequently been found in ancient tumuli, and in other places and positions. A gold bracelet found in a loch in Galloway, and consisting of two artificially intertwining circles, has been assigned to a late Celtic period.[3] British circular golden ornaments have been found in Peebles-shire,[4] in burial-places in many parts of Wales,[5] and in Ireland.[6] But there is nothing in the shape of proof. It is mere conjecture to assign to these bracelets, as has sometimes been done, an ecclesiastical connexion. Such a connexion, in any case, would be more probably with Druidism than with Christianity. The Druid priests of Great Britain may have resembled those of Gaul, who wore golden bracelets and coloured vesture variegated with gold.[7] But the tendency of recent investigation has been to assign to all such relics a distant prehistoric date, as far back possibly as the neolithic period of mankind.[8]

The ritual use of (*i*) *the comb*, now long since obsolete,

[1] The evidence for the Gallican custom in the middle of the sixth century is explicit: 'Manualia vero, id est, manicas induere sacerdotibus mos est,' &c.—Germani Paris. *Expos. brevis Antiq. Lit. Gall.*

[2] *Church of our Fathers*, i. 438.

[3] Stuart's *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, ii. p. 9.

[4] *Archæol. Scot.* iv. 217. [5] *Archæol. Cambrensis*, xiv. 220.

[6] *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, ix. 28, &c.

[7] *Χρυσοφοροῦσί τε γὰρ περὶ μὲν τοῖς τραχήλοις στρεπτὰ ἔχοντες, περὶ δὲ τοῖς βραχίοσι καὶ τοῖς καρποῖς ψέλια, καὶ τὰς ἐσθῆτας βαπτὰς φοροῦσι καὶ χρυσοπάστους οἱ ἐν ἀξιώματι.*—Strabo, *Geog.* lib. iv. p. 197 (302). Edit. Amsterdam, 1707.

[8] Greenwell and Rolleston, *British Barrows*. In an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1878 it is concluded that most of the ornaments belong either to the iron age, or to the third and last, the Mœringian period of the bronze age.

Digitized by Google

but as it was employed in Anglo-Saxon times before High Mass,[1] was possibly derived from the Celtic Church. The comb of S. Kentigern was one of the relics kept in Glasgow Cathedral.[2] The comb of S. Cuthbert was buried with him.[3] Representations of a comb, sometimes accompanied with scissors, are frequently found on the early sculptured stones of Scotland, where its appearance has been variously interpreted as a trace of the Eastern custom of designating the sex of a person by a single-toothed or double-toothed comb, or as a sign of his trade or dignity, or as having some ecclesiastical significance.[4] The Christian character of the device, while just possible, is incapable of proof, and is more nearly disproved by the probable date of the stones themselves, while the character of a Christian priest is usually indicated by other symbols, such as a book in the hand, a chalice and paten, or a consecrated host, as on the Nigg stone.[5]

(*k*) *Crowns* were worn by Celtic bishops instead of mitres. S. Sampson, a Welshman, legendarily described as archbishop of York, and subsequently of Dol, in Brittany, c. A.D. 537, is said to have dreamed that he saw three eminent bishops, adorned with golden crowns, standing before him.[6] There is a representation of an Irish bishop thus crowned on a bas-relief of great antiquity in a ruined chapel in the valley of Glendalough.[7] The use of this crown in a modified shape continued in Anglo-Saxon times until the tenth century, when the mitre, properly so called, begins to be found, resembling a flat cap, and not assuming its present cloven and horned shape till after the Conquest. Sometimes crowns were suspended over shrines, as in the case of the church of S. Bridget, in Ireland, where gold and silver crowns hung

[1] The Anglo-Saxon Ritual was this. If a bishop pontificated, the deacon and sub-deacon combed his hair, as soon as his sandals had been put on his feet, while seated on his episcopal chair within the chancel; if a priest celebrated, the same office of the comb was performed for him seated in the sedilia. More curious was the ritual at Viviers, in France, A.D. 1360, where the ceremony of combing was performed several times during Mass. 'Sacra celebraturus sedet dum in choro Kyrie, Gloria et Credo decantantur, unde quoties assurgebat ipsi capillos pectebat diaconus, amoto ejus capello seu almucio, licet id officii jam in secretario, antequam ad altare procederet, sollicite ei præstitisset. —Du Cange *in verbo* Sedes Majestatis.

[2] *Regist. Glasg.* vol. ii. p. 330. Edinb. 1843.

[3] Reginald, *De adm. S. Cuthberti Virtutibus*, p. 89.

[4] Stuart, J., *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 5, &c.

[5] *Ib.* vol. i. plate xxviii.; vol. ii. plate lvii.

[6] Vita S. Samsonis ab auctore anonymo subæquali, apud Mabillon, *Acta SS.* tom. i. p. 176, sect. 43.

[7] *Transactions of Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xx. pp. 248, 265.

Digitized by Google

over a richly decorated altar.[1] This was an Eastern custom. According to Du Cange, the custom of hanging crowns over the altar in the church of S. Sophia dated from the time of Constantine the Great.[2] It was also a Gallican custom. Crowns were suspended over the tomb of S. Martin, at Tours,[3] in a church to which the early Irish made frequent pilgrimages.[4]

Two figures carved on an old stone at Invergowrie have on their necks ornaments which look like (*l*) *discs of metal*, fastened to the dress by laces passed through small holes perforated in the discs.[5] They are possibly insignia of either lay rank or sacred dignity, or else large brooches, which are often represented as fastening up the dress at the shoulder in the case of ecclesiastics carved on the early Irish stone crosses.[6]

The every-day dress of a Celtic priest included probably (*m*) *sandals*, as represented on the feet of S. Matthew and S. John in the *Book of Kells*[7] (sixth century), or curiously wrought slippers, as on the feet of four ecclesiastics on a sculptured stone at S. Vigeans[8] (eighth century), and a long outer hair cassock called (*n*) a *caracalla*, or *cuculla*, worn over a white underdress, *tunica*, or *pallium*. This was worn by the priest Amphibalus, and assumed by S. Alban in exchange for his own clothes in order to facilitate the escape of the former.[9]

13. SEQUENCE OF COLOURS.—It has been asserted that the assignation to certain seasons of special colours for sacerdotal vestments or altar coverings does not belong to the first eight centuries of Christianity.[10] This is true so far as any elaborate cycle of colours is concerned, such as is prescribed in the later Anglo-Norman uses; but allusion to the ecclesiastical employment in the Celtic Church of at least two colours has been preserved to us.

[1] Cogitosus, *Vita S. Brigidæ*, ap. Canisii *Op.* i. 423.
[2] *Constantinopolis Christiana*, i. iii. 43.
[3] Greg. Tur. *Vita S. Martini*, lib. i. c. 3.
[4] Mabillon, *Acta SS.* i. 293.
[5] Stuart, J., *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. i. plate lxxxvii.
[6] O'Neil, *Irish Crosses*, plates xiv., xxii., xxiv.
[7] Westwood, J. O., *Facsimiles, &c.* p. 30.
[8] Stuart, J., *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. i. plate lxx.; vol. ii. p. 8.
[9] Bede, *Hist. Ec.* i. 7. But the caracalla was not an exclusively ecclesiastical dress. Adamn. *Vit. S. Col.* i. 3, ii. 6, 24, 40; and 'amphibalus' was, at least in Gaul, the Latin for a chasuble. Martene et Durand, *Thes. Anec.* tom. v. col. 99; Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* ii. § 11.
[10] Hefele, *Beiträge zur Archäologie*, ii. 158.

Digitized by Google

Purple.—Gildas refers to the custom of covering the altars in British churches with purple palls.[1] The three choirs of saints which appeared to S. Brendan were clad 'in vestibus candidissimis jacinctinis.'[2] S. Cuthbert was buried in a purple dalmatic, A.D. 687, and when his grave was opened, his body was found to have been buried in purple vestments.[3] In the legend of S. Moling, preserved in the *Book of Leinster*, an Irish MS. of the earlier half of the twelfth century, Christ is represented as appearing to that saint, in a vision vouchsafed to him in a church, clad in a purple garment.[4] Purple is very largely introduced into the earliest extant specimens of illumination, as in the *Book of Kells*[5] and the Irish MSS. at S. Gall. A passage in Bede's works, alluding to the ease with which a red or purple dye could be obtained from shells on the Irish coast,[6] at once explains and renders probable the preponderating ecclesiastical use of this colour. We have also evidence of the use of purple altar-cloths (*pallæ*) in the early Gallican Church. S. Germanus, Bishop of Paris (sixth century), explains the use of this colour by referring to the mention of purple in the Levitical account of the tabernacle.[7] S. Gregory of Tours, in the same century, mentions the defence of the Abbess of S. Radegund against the charge of cutting up a purple altar-cloth for a dress for her niece;[8] and the use of these purple altar-palls was perpetuated, like other British and Gallican customs, in the Anglo-Saxon Church.[9]

White.—The second colour of the ecclesiastical use of which we have distinct mention is white. It was the festal colour at Iona. Adamnan tells us how white vestments were worn by S. Columba and his attendants on the occasion of a celebration of the Eucharist in memory of Columbanus, 'as if it was a holy day.'[10] The same saint dying before the altar at Iona was found clothed in a white dress.[11] White is the only colour referred to in the early Irish canons, which

[1] Gildæ, *Epist.* p. 37.
[2] *Navigatio S. Brendani*, eleventh-century MS., Paris Nat. Lib. No. 3784.
[3] *Reg. Dunelm.* p. 87. [4] Reeves' *British Culdees*, p. 77.
[5] *Facsimiles of Nat. MSS. of Ireland*, plate viii. &c.
[6] *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, viii. 221.
[7] *Expos. brev. Antiq. Lit. Gall.*
[8] Gregorii Tur. *Hist.* lib. x. c. 16.
[9] 'Altaria purpura et serico induta' are mentioned in *Vita S. Wilfridi*, c. xxi., ap. Mabillon, *Acta SS.* tom. v. A purple altar-cloth is depicted in the Benedictional of St. Æthelwold. *Archæologia*, vol. xxiv. p. 116. Five purple altar-cloths were among the gifts of Bishop Leofric to Exeter Cathedral. *Codex Diplo. Anglo-Sax.* iv. 275.
[10] Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, c. 12. [11] Cuminius, *ib.* c. 26.

Digitized by Google

order that the deacon at the time of oblation should be clad in a white vestment.[1] In this employment of white the custom of the Celtic agreed with that of the early Gallican Church. In the fifth and sixth centuries white was recognized in Gaul as the festal, and especially as the Paschal, colour. S. Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, in his will, dated A.D. 499, bequeathed to his successor his white Easter vestment.[2] Similar allusions are found in connexion with S. Cæsarius of Arles[3] and S. Gregory of Tours.[4] S. Germanus of Paris mentions the appearance of angels clad in white at the sepulchre as the symbolical reason for the selection of white as the liturgical colour at Eastertide.[5]

The predominant employment of white and red in the Sarum Use may be a survival of the early Celtic preference for those colours. Is it only a coincidence that the Rule of S. Columba recognized but two classes of martyrdom; 'red martyrdom' (= death) and 'white martyrdom' (= self-mortification)?[6]

14. CHORAL SERVICE.—The services of the Celtic Church, both at the altar and in the choir, were choral. Gildas, referring to Britain, speaks of 'ecclesiastical melodies' and the 'musical voices of the young sweetly singing the praises of God.'[7] The word 'decantare' is used of the introduction of the Liturgy into Ireland in the fifth century, and[8] of its performance at Iona in the sixth century.[9] Adamnan tells us that the voice of S. Columba was so powerful that when he was chanting he could be heard sometimes half a mile, sometimes a mile off:[10] a statement not necessarily involving either miracle or exaggeration in the still air of an autumn day on one of the western islands of Scotland. In Ireland music was an art early cultivated and intimately connected with divine worship. Harpers are represented on the most ancient sculptured stones of Ireland, and pipers are introduced as decorations of initial letters in manuscripts of the eighth and ninth centuries.[11] Irish annals speak of the destruction of church organs, A.D. 814;[12] and organs are known to have

[1] Synod. Hibernens. lib. iii. cap. 6.
[2] Migne, *Bibl. Pat. Lat.* lxv. 971.
[3] Greg. Tur. *Op.* p. 1187, note 1.
[4] *Ib.* p. 1188. [5] *Expos. brev. Antiq. Lit. Gall.*
[6] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils, &c.* ii. i. 120.
[7] *Epist.* p. 44.
[8] *De Officiorum ecclesiasticorum Origine.* Cotton MSS. c. 800.
[9] Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, iii. 12. [10] *Ib.* i. 37.
[11] *Zürich. Antiq. Gesellschaft*, vii. 65.
[12] *Annals of Ulster*, A.D. 814.

Digitized by Google

been in general use in Western Europe before that date.[1] A more interesting question is: What was the character of the music sung in the Celtic Church? To this enquiry, unfortunately, no answer can be given beyond the negative one that it was not the Roman chant in its Gregorian or in any other form; for Bede[2] informs us that the Roman style of singing was first introduced into England generally by Benedict Biscop, Abbot of Wearmouth, A.D. 678, and into the monasteries founded by Scottish missionaries in the north of England by S. Wilfrid (d. A.D. 709). Dr. O'Conor, discussing the question at some length and with much ingenuity and research,[3] endorses to a certain extent the conclusion of Mabillon, that the choral service of the British Church, which was not 'juxta morem Romanum,' was therefore 'juxta morem Orientalem.'[4] The Eastern mode, having been introduced into the monasteries of Lerins and Marseilles,[5] and having been learned there or elsewhere by Germanus and Lupus, was by them introduced into Great Britain in the fifth century, and found its way into the Celtic communities of Ireland and Scotland. The subject is not sufficiently relevant to the Liturgy to be discussed here at further length.

15. INCENSE.—We have been unable to discover any passage referring to the use of incense in the Celtic Church. Thuribles, or incense-cups, have often been found in British burial-places, as at Lancaster Moor,[6] Brixworth,[7] &c. The perforation of these cups near the upper rim implies that they were to be swung, and the occurrence of ornamentation on the under surface, which is not found in cinerary and other urns, proves that they were intended to be suspended above the

[1] There are drawings of organs in the Utrecht Psalter (sixth or ninth cent.) in the illustrations of Pss. cl., cli. There is a still earlier representation of an organ on one of the Catacomb stones in the Monastery of S. Paolo fuori le Mura near Rome. S. Augustine mentions organs with bellows in his day (fifth cent.). Comment. in Ps. lvi. Benedict. edit. tom. iv. p. 538. These organs must have been curious and cumbrous structures if they resembled that which Ælfig, Bishop of Winchester (A.D. 934–51) caused to be constructed in his monastery, and which required seventy men to blow it :—

'Bisseni supra sociantur in ordine folles,
Inferiusque jacent quattuor atque decem:
Flatibus alternis spiracula maxima reddunt;
Quos agitant validi septuaginta viri.'

Wolstanus in *Prologo ad vitam metricam S. Suithuni.* Leland, *Collect.* i. 152.

[2] *Hist. Ec.* iv. 18.
[3] *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores*, vol. iv. pp. 153–160.
[4] *De Cursu Gallicano*, p. 381. [5] Cassian, *Institut.* lib. ii. an. 430.
[6] *British Archæol. Journal*, xxi. 161. [7] *Ib.* xix. 21.

Digitized by Google

level of the eye. The symbol of the cross has been found on some of these urns, as on those discovered at Bryn Sciont, Carnarvonshire, and at other places.[1] The date of such relics is undetermined. The mark of the cross used generally to be referred to as an evidence of their connexion with Christianity, and has often been relied upon by antiquarians as a proof of a post-Christian date, as in the case of bronze spoons found at Llanfair in Wales, of inscribed stones, &c.[2] But the cross has been found as an emblem on vases, ornaments, and relics, both in the British islands and in continental pile-wrought villages and lacustrine dwellings and cemeteries, many centuries anterior to the Christian era;[3] and the most recent and experienced archæologists are decided in their view that these incense urns have no connexion with Christianity.[4]

16. JOINT CONSECRATION.—A very singular custom existed at Iona of two or more priests being ordinarily united in the Eucharistic prayer and act of consecration; to consecrate singly being the prerogative of bishops, or of individual priests specially selected and empowered to consecrate on account of their sanctity or eminence. Adamnan relates how—

'on one occasion a stranger from the province of Munster, who concealed through humility the fact that he was a bishop, was invited on the next Sunday by Columba to join with him in consecrating the body of Christ, that as two priests they might break the bread of the Lord together. Columba, on going to the altar, discovered his rank, and addressed him thus: Christ bless thee, brother, consecrate alone as a bishop; now we know that thou art of episcopal rank. Why hast thou endeavoured to disguise thyself so long, and to prevent our giving thee the honour due to thee?'[5]

On another occasion, four illustrious visitors from Ireland paid a special mark of respect to S. Columba, who was only in priest's orders, by requesting him to offer the Eucharist in their presence.[6]

This custom of joint celebrants in the case of priests, and of a single celebrant in the case of a bishop, is peculiar to the Celtic Church, no similar practice existing in any other country or at any other time. There was something exactly

[1] *Archæol. Cambrensis*, 3rd Ser. vol. xiv. p. 25, figs. 18, 19; p. 260, figs. 23, 24.
[2] *Ib.* vol. viii. p. 219; vol. for 1856, p. 49.
[3] Gabriel de Montillet, *Le Signe de la Croix avant le Christianisme.* Paris, 1866.
[4] Greenwell and Rolleston, *British Barrows*, p. 76, &c.
[5] Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, i. 44.
[6] *Ib.* iii. 17.

Digitized by Google

opposed to it in the once general, but now nearly obsolete, rule of the Western Church, that when a bishop celebrated the priests present should unite with him in the words and acts of consecration.[1] This direction still survives in the Roman service for the Ordering of Presbyters, when the newly ordained priests join with the bishop in repeating the words of the Canon.[2] A similar custom existed at Chartres, on Maundy Thursday, as late as the fifteenth century.[3]

17. ALMS AND OBLATIONS.—Oblations of bread and wine for the Eucharistic service, and offerings in the shape of alms, were made in accordance with the custom of the ancient Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies immediately before the recitation from the diptychs of the names of departed saints.[4] One of the first questions put by S. Augustine to Pope Gregory, after his arrival in England, was as to the proportion in which such alms and offerings were to be distributed.[5] Early Irish Canons, attributed to S. Patrick, laid down that the offerings of the wicked and excommunicate were not to be accepted.[6] The same saint mentions in his *Confession* how the devoted and warm-hearted Irish women among his disciples made offerings at his altar of ornaments and personal presents, and how he offended them by always returning them afterwards, lest the unbelieving should have appearance of ground for scandal against him.[7] In the Mozarabic and Gallican Liturgies an anthem or hymn was sung during the offertory, called *sacrificium* or *sonum*. Such may be the short anthem preserved in the Antiphonary of Bangor, and entitled

'*Pro eleemosynariis.*—Dispersit, dedit pauperibus, justitia ejus manet in sæculum sæculi, cornu ejus exaltabitur in gloria.

'Eleemosynas facientibus in hoc mundo retribue, Domine, in regno tuo sancto.'

[1] Martene, *De antiq. Eccles. Rit.* i. 3, 8. Amalarius, lib. i. cap. 12.

[2] The rubric in the Pontifical (*De Ordinatione Presbyteri*) directs the celebrating bishop to speak 'aliquantulum alte, ita ut ordinati sacerdotes possint secum omnia dicere et præsertim verba consecrationis, quæ dici debent eodem momento per ordinatos quo dicuntur per pontificem.'

[3] 'Le Jeudi-Saint six archidiacres prêtres célèbrent la grand' messe conjointement avec l'évêque. L'évêque est au milieu de l'autel; il a trois prêtres à sa droite, et trois à sa gauche, sur la même ligne. Ils chantent tous sept unanimement et pratiquent ensemble toutes les cérémonies de la messe.'—De Moléon, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 231.

[4] Cuminius, *De Mensura Pœnitentiarum*, cap. xiii.

[5] Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 27.

[6] S. Patricii Synodus, can. ii. Synodus Episcoporum Patricii, Auxilii, Isernini, can. xii.

[7] Patricii *Confessio*, cap. xxi.

Digitized by Google

Lines which resemble the Offertorium of the Roman, and still more closely the offertory sentences of the vernacular Anglican Liturgy.

18. UNLEAVENED BREAD.—Dr. Döllinger enumerates the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist among the peculiarities of the British Church, and as one of the points on which it differed from the rest of Western Christendom:

'Dass der Gebrauch der Azyma eine Eigenthümlichkeit der Briten gewesen sey, schliesse ich aus einer Stelle der Capitula selecta Canonum hibern. bei D'Achery, Spicileg. i. 505. Gildas ait: Britones toti mundo contrarii, moribus Romanis inimici non solum in missa, sed etiam in tonsura cum Judæis umbræ futurorum servientes. Gerade so drückt sich Nicetas contra Latinos, Bibl. PP. Max. xviii. 405, aus: Qui azymorum adhuc participant sub umbra legis sunt et Hebræorum mensam comedunt.'[1]

This ingenious inference is supported, as far as the continental Celtic Church (seventh century) is concerned, by a statement of Walafrid Strabo, that it was the custom of S. Gall to use unleavened bread.[2] The design at the foot of the monogram of the *Book of Kells* may be taken to prove that circular wafer bread stamped with a cross (×) was in use in Ireland in the sixth century. The consecrated wafer is there drawn between two mice which refuse to nibble at the wafer, and are followed by two cats which refuse to attack the mice, two other mice being comfortably seated on their backs.[3] The host, in a circular form, with a chalice or portable altar underneath it, is represented between two kneeling figures on the Nigg stone in Ross-shire.[4] Dr. Döllinger is not quite correct in inferring that in their use of unleavened bread the Celtic Church differed from the rest of Western Christendom, 'während man sich damals in der römischen Kirche und im übrigen Occident noch des gesäuerten Brodes bediente;' and Bingham is quite wrong in asserting that 'it is a matter beyond all dispute that the Church for a thousand years used no other but common or leavened bread in the Eucharist.'[5] Unleavened bread was not only used, as we have seen, in the early Celtic Church, but also in the African

[1] *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, p. 217. Landshut, 1833.

[2] *Vita S. Galli*, i. 17.

[3] Dr. Todd suggests that these animals are beavers with their young. *Illumination of Ancient Irish MSS.* pl. 1. *Descriptive Remarks*, p. 10.

[4] Stuart, J., *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. i. plate xxviii. In mediæval Celtic literature there are plentiful allusions to wafer bread. *Black Book of Carmarthen* (twelfth century), xxvii. pt. ii. *Book of Taliessin* (fourteenth century), xvii. 74.

[5] *Antiq.* xv. 11. 5.

Digitized by Google

Church in S. Cyprian's time,[1] in the Spanish Church in the ninth century,[2] and in the Roman Church in Alcuin's time.[3]

19. MIXED CHALICE.—The universal custom of the primitive Church to mix water with the wine for consecration in the Eucharistic cup obtained in the Celtic Church also. This may be inferred from the account of S. Columba in his youth acting on one occasion as deacon, and fetching water for the celebration of the Eucharist.[4] On one occasion, when S. Findan of Movilla was celebrating, water only, and not wine, had been provided. S. Columba, who was present, removed the difficulty by turning water into wine.[5] The cross engraved on bronze spoons found at Llanfair in Wales has been held to be a proof of their connexion with Christian usage,[6] and it has been suggested that they were Eucharistic spoons used for the administration of the consecrated wine. This is merely a conjecture, faintly supported by the fact that a bronze chalice was used by S. Columbanus in the sixth century, and that another bronze chalice of eighth century Irish workmanship is still preserved in the convent of Kremsmünster on the Rhine. If these bronze spoons had any liturgical use at all, they were more probably employed for conveying a little water into the chalice of wine before consecration. Such might have been the use of the small bronze spoon found under S. Martin's cross at Iona, and now in the possession of the Duke of Argyll,[7] and of a diminutive gold spoon found some years ago in the river Bann.[8] But except for their ornamentation, the evidential value of which is very small,[9] it is more probable that all these spoons were put to ordinary culinary rather than to any ecclesiastical use.

20. COMMUNION IN BOTH KINDS.—We might infer the fact of Communion in both kinds from such words as these of Columbanus:—

'If thou art thirsty, drink the Fount of Life; if thou art hungry, eat the Bread of Life. Blessed are they who hunger for this Bread,

[1] Cypriani *Ep.* lxiii. 3.
[2] Martene, *De Antiq. Eccles. Rit.* I. iii. vii. 26.
[3] Alcuini *Ep.* lxxv., *Ad fratres Lugdun.* tom. i. p. 107.
[4] Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, ii. 1.
[5] *Leabhar Breac*, fol. 31 b.
[6] *Archæol. Cambrens.* 3rd ser. vol. viii. p. 219.
[7] *Ulster Journal of Archæol.* i. 80.
[8] *Ib.* i. 81. See also an account of bronze spoons found at Weston in the *Proceedings of the Soc. of Antiquaries for Scotland*, vol. viii. p. 363, plate viii.
[9] See above, p. 73, note 3.

Digitized by Google

and thirst for this Fount; for ever eating and drinking they still desire to eat and drink.'[1]

This is a metaphor, the full force of which would be lost in a Church where Communion in one kind only was the rule. But more direct proof is forthcoming. In the rule of Columbanus a special penalty is attached to any who injure the chalice with their teeth.[2] In S. Sechnall's Hymn in praise of S. Patrick, that saint is described as one 'who draws heavenly wine in heavenly cups and gives drink to the people of God from a spiritual chalice.'[3] The Communion Hymn of the early Irish Church, previously quoted, is full of allusions to the reception of the chalice.[4] So are the following formulæ of administration and post-communion collects:—

'*Ad Communicare.*—Hoc sacrum corpus Domini et Salvatoris sanguinem sumite vobis in vitam perennem. Alleluia.'—[*S. Gall MSS.* No. 1394.]

'Comedite, amici mei, et inebriamini, carissimi. Hoc sacrum corpus Domini Salvatoris sanguinem sumite in vitam eternam.'—[*Stowe Missal.*]

'Corpus Domini accepimus, et sanguine ejus potati sumus, et omni malo non timebimus, quia Dominus nobiscum est.'—[*Antiph. Bench.*]

'Refecti Christi corpore et sanguine tibi semper, Domine, dicemus Alleluia.'—[*Ib.*]

In the Lives of the Saints similar expressions abound, *e.g.*, 'After the girl had received the Body of Christ and His Blood, she died without anxiety,' and 'The old man pointed out to them the land of which they were in search, the land of promise, and having received the Body of Christ and His Blood he went to heaven.'[5] Reference has already been made to the possible connexion of certain ancient spoons

[1] S. Columbani *Instructio*, xiv., 'De fonte vivo Christo Jesu adeundo et potando.'

[2] *Regula Cœnobialis*, cap. iv.

[3] *Irish Archæological and Celtic Society*, vol. xvii. p. 19.

[4] See above, p. 62.

[5] Irish Life of S. Brendan in Todd's *Life of S. Patrick*, p. 460, n. Although the separate mention of the Body and Blood of Christ indicates the double administration, the absence of such twofold mention does not necessarily disprove it. In a Life of S. Columbanus, written by Jonas, a Piedmontese (seventh century), that saint is described as giving the viaticum to another person also named Columbanus, in these words: 'Corpus Christi abeunti de hac vita viaticum præbet.' Fleming, *Collectan.* p. 228—a passage quoted by Roman writers in proof of the early administration in one kind only. Dr. Rock (*Church of our Fathers*, i. 133) draws the same inference from the expression 'oblationis particula,' Bede, *H. E.* iv. 14.

Digitized by Google

with the administration of the Eucharist.[1] In the church of Kildare there was a special door through which S. Bridget and her virgins passed, that they might enjoy the banquet of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.[2] The act of Communion was called 'going to the chalice' in the Rule of the Irish Culdees.[3] S. Cuthbert, who cannot be supposed in his later days to have deserted, on such a point as this, the Celtic traditions of his youth,[4] was entreated by an officer of the court of Egfrid, King of Northumberland, to send a priest to visit his wife before her death, and to administer to her the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,[5] and himself, immediately before his own death, received the blessed Sacrament in both kinds from the hands of Herefride, Abbot of Lindisfarne.[6] The cup was administered by a deacon. There are extant certain canonical regulations of the Welsh Church (A.D. 589), where, among the penances attached to greater crimes, are a refusal of permission to a priest to celebrate, or to a deacon to hold the chalice.[7]

21. WOMEN TO BE VEILED AT THE RECEPTION OF THE SACRAMENT.—Among the regulations attributable to Cuminius, Abbot of Iona (seventh century) was one that women should receive the Communion under a dark veil, and S. Basil is referred to as an authority for this undoubtedly Eastern custom.[8] The Apostolical Constitutions contain a similar order, in a passage adduced by Bunsen as a proof of their Eastern origin: *καὶ γυναῖκες κατακεκαλυμμέναι τὴν κεφαλὴν, ὡς ἁρμόζει, γυναικῶν τάξει προσερχέσθωσαν.* (Bk. ii. ch. 57).[9] This was also a custom of the early Gallican Church, where a head-covering (Dominicale) was ordered to be worn by women at the time of communion by the forty-second canon of the Council of Auxerre. There is some uncertainty about the interpretation of the word 'Dominicale,' but it may be noted that women are generally represented as veiled in early sacred art.[10] In later times, Irish women were prohibited from going near the altar, or from taking the chalice in their hands:[11] 'Nulla femina ad altare Domini accedet nec calicem Domini

[1] p. 76 *sup.* [2] Cogitosus, *Vita S. Brigidæ*, ap. Canisii *Op.* i. 423.
[3] Reeves' edit. p. 86.
[4] Communion in both kinds was the practice of the Anglo-Saxon Church in common with the rest of Christendom.
[5] Bede *De Vit. Cuthberti*, cap. 15. [6] *Ib.* cap. 39.
[7] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils, &c.* i. 119.
[8] Cuminius *De Mensura Pœnitent.* cap. xiv.
[9] *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, iii. 248.
[10] J. H. Parker's Roman Photographs, Nos. 479, 1710.
[11] *Leabhar Breac*, fol. 248.

Digitized by Google

tangat.' The latter part of this injunction proves it to be of considerable antiquity. It occurs in a 'Sermo sinodalis parrotianis preopeteris,' but must surely have had only a local application. Yet injunctions of a similar character were not confined to Ireland. The Gallican constitutions of Theodore, Bishop of Orleans (A.D. 802–11), ordered 'Ut feminæ ad altare non accedant.'[1] Women were formerly not allowed to enter the chancel of Durham Cathedral within a line of blue marble which ran across the nave.[2] Plentiful information as to the custom of the Mediæval Church in connection with this subject has been collected by Mr. Simmons in his recent edition of the *Lay Folk's Mass Book*.[3]

22. COMMUNION OF INFANTS.—There are traces of the once universal custom of administering the Eucharist to children after baptism in the Stowe Missal, where a formula of Communion and several Collects of Thanksgiving after Eucharistic reception are placed at the close of a Baptismal Office, the language of which implies that it was intended to be used in the case of infants as well as of adults (fol. 59 a, b.) In a later Irish Ordo Baptismi (twelfth century) it is directed that the newly baptized infant shall be confirmed by a Bishop, if present.[4] There may also be some significance in the appointment of S. Matthew (xix. 14)[5] as an 'Antiphona ad Communionem' in the Stowe Missal (fol. 36 b) and in S. Gall MS. No. 1394 (fol. 2 b).

23. RESERVATION.—The consecrated elements were reserved for the use of the sick or absent, to whom they were afterwards conveyed. A person going to procure the Communion for the sick was exempt from liability to arrest, and from the law of distress.[6] Special warnings were directed against the loss of the reserved Sacrament from a boat or bridge or while on horseback.[7] The decolorization of the reserved Sacrament, mentioned as a test of its corruption in the Regula S. Columbani (c. 15), possibly points to the conjoint reservation of both species.[8] The conjoint administration of both reserved elements is implied in the Celtic formulæ of administration in the cases of sick or deathbed Communion preserved in the Books of Dimma, Mulling, and Deer.

[1] Pertz, *Leges*, i. 107, 171.
[2] *Irish Life of S. Cuthbert*, Surt. Soc. Biog. Miscell. pp. 63–87.
[3] Early Eng. Text. Soc. vol. lxxi. pp. 233–236.
[4] Corpus Missal, p. 203.
[5] 'Sinite parvulos,' etc.
[6] *Senchus Mor.* i. 267.
[7] Cuminius, *De Mensura Pœnitent.* cap. xiii.
[8] Fleming, *Collectanea Sacra*, 24.

Digitized by Google

'*Das ei eucharistiam, dicens:* Corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi Filii Dei vivi conservet animam tuam in vitam perpetuam.'—[Book of Dimma.]

'*Tunc reficitur corpore et sanguine:* Corpus cum sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi sanitas sit tibi in vitam æternam.'—[Book of Mulling.]

'*Hisund dubar sacorfaicc dau* (Angl., Here give the sacrifice to him): Corpus cum sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi sanitas sit tibi in vitam perpetuam et salutem.'—[Book of Deer.]

24. EULOGIA.—It was a primitive Eastern custom, at the conclusion of the Liturgy, to bless a loaf of bread, which was then cut up into small pieces with a knife specially consecrated for that purpose, and distributed to the congregation, who came forward and received it at the priest's hand. There is ample evidence of the prevalence of such a custom in the primitive and mediæval Church, where the consecrated bread was variously known as Eulogia or Antidoron, Panis Benedictus, Pain Bénit. The custom remains in the Greek Church.

There are proofs of its existence also in the Celtic Church. Adamnan informs us that at S. Kenneth's Church at Aghaboe in Ireland there was a table in the refectory on which the Eulogia was cut up for distribution. The passage is curious, as showing that in Ireland (sixth century) it was customary to partake of the Eulogia, not in connexion with the Eucharist in the oratory, but at the afternoon meal in the refectory.[1] The same custom existed at Iona in Scotland,[2] and (it has been inferred from a passage in an old hymn attributed to S. Columba) under the same conditions of time and place as at Aghaboe.[3] At Lindisfarne in S. Cuthbert's time it was distributed at the third hour after Mass.[4] In the continental Celtic monasteries of S. Columbanus it was distributed after Mass on Sundays and holy days. It is recorded of the saintly and humble Ermenfried, who presided over the Columban monastery of Cusance (625–670), that he always kissed the hands of the poorest persons before its distribution.[5]

25. DAYS AND HOURS OF CELEBRATION.—There does not appear to have been a daily Eucharist in the Celtic Church, but only on Sundays, saints' days, and days specially appointed by the head of the monastery. By the old law of distress in Ireland a stay of two days was granted in the case

[1] *Vit. S. Columbæ*, ii. 12. [2] *Ib.* ii. 4.
[3] Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 99.
[4] S. Cuthberti *Vita Anon.*, quoted in Rock, *Church of our Fathers*, i. 138.
[5] Egilbertus, *Vita S. Ermenfredi*, ap. Bolland. tom. vii. Sept. p. 120.

Digitized by Google

of church furniture, and the requisites of the Mass, though it be not celebrated every day.[1]

On Sundays.—When four distinguished Irish saints visited S. Columba, and requested that he would celebrate in their presence, he complied with their request, as usual, on Sunday.[2] The same saint is described as celebrating on the last Sunday (June 2, 597) before his death, which took place on the Saturday following.[3] Cuminius in his *Penitential* defends the custom of Sunday celebrations by reference to the custom of the Greeks.[4] In the eighth century in Ireland there was a seven years' probation for admission into the society of the Culdees. In the first year the novice was not allowed to communicate at all, only to be present at the sacrifice. In the second year his Communions began, and gradually increased in number till they mounted in the seventh year to Communion on every Sunday.[5]

On Holy Days.—We read of S. Columba at Iona giving special orders for the celebration of the Eucharist in commemoration of S. Brendan [6] and of S. Columbanus,[7] and it is added that the latter order was carried out in detail as if it had been a regular and recognized holy day. Passengers on their way to Iona prayed that they might reach the island in time to celebrate the Eucharist on the day dedicated to SS. Columba and Baithene.[8] We read of a celebration on a holy day in the sixth century in Ireland, in the church of S. Finnian at Movilla, county Down.[9] In S. Bridget's church at Kildare, early in the sixth century, there was a celebration on Sundays and on the vigils of the feasts of Apostles.[10] In the mother church of every Irish monastery in the eighth century there was an offering on every altar on Sundays and solemnities.[11] S. Gall ordered a special celebration in commemoration of S. Columbanus on receiving intelligence of his death,[12] and doubtless from that day forward the festival of S. Columbanus was added to the Calendar of S. Gall.

Hour of Service.—Mass was usually celebrated at an early hour in the day. The mass of S. Columbanus was

[1] *Senchus Mor.* vol. i. p. 126.
[2] 'Die dominica ex more.' Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, iii. 17.
[3] *Ib.* iii. 23. [4] Cuminius, *De Mensura Pœnitent.* cap. xiv.
[5] Rule of the Culdees, p. 87. Reeves' edit., Dublin, 1864.
[6] Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, iii. 11.
[7] *Ib.* iii. 12. [8] *Ib.* ii. 45. [9] *Ib.* ii. 1.
[10] Cogitosus, *Vita S. Brigidæ*, c. 29.
[11] Rule of the Culdees, Reeves' edit. p. 94.
[12] Wal. Strabo, *Vita S. Galli*, I. ii. 27.

Digitized by Google

celebrated by S. Columba at Iona 'in the morning;'[1] by S. Gall in Switzerland 'at daybreak.'[2] That of S. Brendan at Iona was in 'the very early morning.'[3] The solemn mass of S. Baithene was sung at 'the later hour of noon.' An early hour was ordered in the continental Irish monasteries under a heavy penalty.[4] It should be noted that in all these passages, as usually in the language of the seventh century, the word *Missa* means the Liturgy, and such phrases as *missarum sollemnia* and *sacra Eucharistiæ ministeria* are used as synonymous expressions. But the word *Missa* is also occasionally used to denote any sacred office. The last service at which S. Columba was present is called *vespertinalis Dominicæ noctis missa*. This service was evidently *Vigiliæ nocturnæ* or *nocturns*.[5] The word *Missale* has been also used to denote not only the text of the Eucharistic Service, but also that of other sacred books. Thus the book, which is called the Book of the Gospels in the Irish Life of S. Columba, is called by Colgan in his Latin translation *Missarum Liber*.

26. INSTRUMENTA CELTICA LITURGICA.—*Paten and Chalice.*—The paten (*discus* or *patena*, S. Evin, *Vita S. Patricii*, ii. 54; *patinus*, *Book of Armagh*, ff. 8, 11) and the chalice (*calix Domini*, Adamnan, *De Locis Sanctis*, i. 8; *vas*, Wal. Strabo, *Vita S. Galli*, i. 19; *laguncula*, *ib.* i. 19) seem to have been originally made of glass. A stone altar, with four glass chalices upon it, is mentioned as having been discovered by S. Patrick in a cave.[6] The cups and patens brought by that saint on his arrival in Ireland from beyond the sea were probably of the same material,[7] for there is evidence of the early use of glass chalices in Gaul.[8] Bronze chalices were in use in the Irish continental monasteries. S. Gall refused to use silver vessels for the altar, saying that S. Columbanus was accustomed to offer the sacrifice in vessels of bronze, in memory of the fact that his Saviour was fastened to the cross with brazen nails.[9] A golden chalice, a relic of Iona, perhaps coeval with S. Columba himself, once existed, but

[1] 'Mane.' Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, iii. 12.
[2] 'Primo diluculo.' Wal. Strabo, *Vita S. Galli*, cap. xxvi.
[3] 'Mane primo.' Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, iii. 11.
[4] *Ib.* ii. 45; iii. 23.
[5] *Ib.* iii. 23.
[6] S. Evin, *Vita S. Patricii*, ii. 35. The story is copied into later biographies, and sometimes adduced as evidence of the existence of Christianity in Ireland before the arrival of S. Patrick.
[7] Scholiast on S. Fiacc's Hymn, in Todd's *Life of S. Patrick*, p. 411.
[8] S. Hilary of Arles possessed *patenæ et calices vitrei*. Honorati, *Vita S. Patricii*, ap. Bolland. *Acta SS.* v. Maii, tom. ii. p. 28.
[9] Wal. Strabo, *Vita S. Galli*, i. 19.

Digitized by Google

has been recently lost.[1] A similar fate has attended the relics of S. Kieran (sixth century). When his grave was opened, A.D. 1791, his relics comprised a crozier, some beads, a hollow brass ball which opened, a paten, and a chalice.[2]

Fan.—The only evidence for the use of this well-known Eastern accessory of liturgical worship is derived from illuminations in ancient MSS. A *flabellum* or *fan* is depicted in the right hand of S. Matthew in a Hiberno-Saxon MS. of the Gospels (eighth century) at Treves,[3] and in the hands of angels in the monogram of the *Book of Kells* (sixth century), where they seem to be constructed of thin plates of metal surrounded by little bells like those used by the Maronites.[4]

Knife.—A knife is placed in the left hand of S. Matthew in the Treves Gospels, and in the right hand of the right-hand figure in the monogram of the Garland of Howth.[5] It is impossible without further evidence to decide for what purpose this knife was employed, though its character as a sacred symbol is evident. It may have been used, as the holy spear is used in the Eastern Church, for the ceremonial piercing of the Amnos, or, as the knife set apart for that purpose in the Anglo-Saxon Church, for cutting up the Eulogiæ.[6]

We have now placed before the reader some of the accessible information as to the earliest form of Eucharistic doctrine, worship, and ritual in our native country. While we lament the non-survival of any complete pre-Roman Liturgy, we are yet able by aid of the foregoing pages to reconstruct hypothetically very much of the altar service of the British Church. If it is asked, What is the practical use of this accumulation of out-of-the-way information on recondite points of a bygone ritual? what is its bearing on modern controversy? our answer is this: We wish to prove, and we claim to have proved, that in the reintroduction of frequent celebrations, early communions, and choral services, in the use of such ritual adjuncts as the eastward position, the

[1] The circumstances of the loss are described in Wilson's *Archæology of Scotland*, pp. 68, 69.

[2] Royal Hist. &c. Archæol. Assoc. for Ireland, vol. for 1870.

[3] Westwood, *Facsimiles, &c.* plate xx.

[4] *Ib.* plate liii. No. 7. The fan must have been more ornamental than useful in the climate of this country. Plentiful evidence for its use in other parts of Western Christendom, including France, is collected in Gerbert, *Liturg. Aleman.* i. 228; Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiq.* sub voc. Flabellum. V. Facsimile of a French MS. (thirteenth century) in Bastard's *Peintures et Ornements*, vol. iii.

[5] Todd, J. H., *Descriptive Remarks, &c.* plate iii.

[6] Rock, *Church of our Fathers*, i. 36. See p. 80.

Digitized by Google

mixed chalice, the Eucharistic vestments, &c., High Churchmen are not aping modern Rome, but preserving outward and visible signs of the oneness of the faith and worship offered in these islands from the earliest dawn of the Christian era. It is not introducing the errors of a mediæval Latin Church, or the fantastic inventions of modern ritualists, but it is renewing and perpetuating the Eucharistic doctrine and ritual of an ancient British Church in which the claims of a foreign pontiff were at first unknown, and in which, when they became known, they were either resisted or ignored. In conclusion we would ask any unprejudiced reader of the foregoing pages this question: If S. Alban, S. Patrick, S. Columba, were to come to life again, where would they find themselves most at home?—in the meagre, thinly frequented, seldom celebrated Communion service of fifty years ago, or in the thronged choral Eucharist, now happily no rare sight in many a church which has passed under the influence of the so-called Catholic revival?

Art. IV.—THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TEMPLARS IN ENGLAND.

1. *Histoire de l'Abolition des Templiers.* (Paris, 1789.)
2. *Monumens Historiques relatifs à la Condemnation des Chevaliers du Temple.* Par F. J. M. Raynouard. (Toulouse, 1813.)
3. *Memorandum Register of Bishop Dalderby.* (Lincoln. MS.)

The under-currents of history are often more strange and striking than the main events which seem to determine the fate of nations. The deeper we dig down into the historic mine the more precious jewels do we find. And the mine is by no means exhausted. There were a vast amount of influences at work in mediæval England (for instance), which, even with the fuller light now being rapidly poured in, are yet obscure and unapprehended by historians. Some of the chief factors in this history were the 'Religious Orders,' with their intrigues and counter-intrigues. The history of the Religious Orders has never yet been written, and probably never can be written fully. Encomiasts have constructed ideal glorifications of them. Satirists have coloured all their doings

Digitized by Google

with a senseless invective. But the historian proper, the man who seeks for truth at any price, has not dealt with them. Who, for instance, has explained the rapid degeneracy of the Franciscans, or the strange ferocity of the Papal crusade against the Observant section of them? Who has given any sufficient or exhaustive account of that most marvellous episode of history, the fall of the Templars?

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Templars were the most famous, the most powerful, the most wealthy, and the most popular of all the Religious Orders. The whole of Christendom regarded the Order with admiration and reverence. Its services to the Church had been signal, its devotion to its duties remarkable. Then, in a moment, it fell, and fell amidst the deepest disgrace, assailed with the foulest accusations, with the finger of scorn and loathing pointed at it. Has this been ever fully accounted for and explained? Why was it—even if there were a savage and unscrupulous King of France, and a timid and compliant Pope—why was it that there was no semblance of a popular movement in behalf of the Templars, and no ruler in Europe who offered them an effectual aid? Some light might probably be thrown upon these points, and on others connected with the fate of the Templars in France and other countries of Europe. But they do not form part of the subject designed to be treated of here. Suffice it to indicate one especial source of hostility to the Templars, which has hardly been touched by historians, viz., the bitter hatred entertained against them by the Mendicant Orders. Wherever we find Templars accused, tortured, suffering, there are Dominicans and Franciscans taking the lead in the attacks upon them.

In the space of the two hundred years of its history, the Order planted by the little band of nine French gentlemen to defend the pilgrims going to Jerusalem had grown into marvellous proportions. By the end of that period, it possessed, besides its head-quarters or court in the island of Cyprus, preceptories or branch establishments in all the countries of Europe. It numbered 15,000 Knights, and a far greater number of servitors or aspirants. It exercised sway over two kingdoms, those of Cyprus and the Lesser Armenia. Its Grand Master took the title of king, and styled himself 'By the Grace of God.' His court was more thronged and splendid than that of any prince. He had his Ministers, who, by a complete and thorough organization, regulated the affairs of the Order in all the countries of Europe, and drew supplies from them for the central expenditure. In the chief

Digitized by Google

kingdoms of Europe, the Order was represented by officers named Grand Priors, who dwelt in magnificent palaces, and kept up the most brilliant state. Though regarded with jealousy, no doubt, by the kings and princes, the Templars had always been able to live well with them, shielded either by their own conduct, or by the fear which attached to their power. The prestige of religion was thrown around them. They were the soldiers of Christendom against the Infidel. Thousands of them had laid down their lives in the fruitless struggle to win the Holy Land from the Pagans. A Pope had constituted their Order, and assigned to them the white mantle and red cross for their habit. The reigning Pontiff was head of their Order. Their rule was drawn from S. Augustine, and was enlarged and perfected by S. Bernard. Suddenly astonished Europe heard, with infinite amazement, that the Knights of this famous Order had, on a certain day (October 13, 1307), been seized throughout France and most of the countries of Europe, had been thrown into prison, and subjected to the direst tortures to make them confess to charges so incredible, so abominable, that to impute them to the meanest miscreant and caitiff might seem outrageously absurd. Wonder followed upon wonder. Men heard that these famous Knights, the very flower of Christendom, had, in the great majority of instances, confessed the truth of these accusations, branded themselves as apostates, practisers of magic, addicted to abominable crimes. But while good men throughout Europe crossed themselves with pious horror and shuddered as they thought of the terrible power of the Evil One, all this time a portentous lie was being enacted, and a body of gallant knights, no worse in their morals than other knights of their era, and far above most in high aims, disciplined valour, and ready self-sacrifice, were being immolated to glut the revenge, and replenish the exhausted coffers of the most unscrupulous and daring, as well as one of the ablest, monarchs who ever ruled in France.[1] In his fierce struggle against Boniface VIII., the most pretentious of Popes, Philip the Fair had been constantly met and thwarted by the Templars, pledged to devotion to the head of their Order. In his attempt to debase the coinage of the land, to meet his exigencies, men in the garb of Templars had headed the

[1] 'Ce roi, qui avait envahi les biens des églises, qui avait opprimé ses peuples, qui avait falsifié la monnaie, qui avait dépouillé tous les Juifs de ses états, et recherché d'autres profits honteux, pouvait bien être tenté par les richesses du Temple, lui qui les envahit, après avoir déclaré par ses lettres patentes qu'il les respecterait.'—Sismondi, *Rép. Ital.* iii. 180.

Digitized by Google

revolt which nearly cost Philip his kingdom and his life. He had sworn to take vengeance upon the Order. Then came ready to his hand accusations from base men, who, having belonged to the Order, and been expelled, desired at once to gratify their revenge, and save the lives forfeited to the law by their misdeeds by pandering to the King's violent passions. The accusations, utterly incredible, were accepted without sifting. Dominican Inquisitors were ready to aid the project. The Pope was a French Archbishop, completely in the power of the King, and so the Templars were generally seized and imprisoned. The paramount influence of Philip acting with the Pope was sufficient to procure the adoption of the same policy practised in France in most of the other countries of Europe. The dreadful tale of torture followed, torture more savage, more diabolically cruel, than, perhaps, ever used before or since. The Templars, overcome by the agonies of their trial, and hoping, if they confessed, easily to obtain absolution from the Pope, in many cases admitted the charges, though some persevered, even to the death, in their assertions of innocence. But soon, those who had confessed, ashamed of their weakness, generally withdrew their admissions, believing that the Pope, who was holding a formal inquiry into the charges against the Order, would do them justice. They little knew, however, the man with whom they had to deal. While the long-drawn out inquiry was proceeding before the Pope, the unhappy wretches who had confessed and retracted were seized upon by the Inquisition, under Royal directions, as relapsed heretics, and suffered all the penalties of that terrible accusation. In one day no less than fifty-six of these were burnt by slow fires, near to the abbey of S. Anthony, in the environs of Paris. Philip put the finishing touch to this work, when, before the Church of Notre Dame, in Paris, a prince of the blood-royal of France, and Jacques du Moulay, the Grand Master of the Templars, both of whom had confessed and retracted, were burned in charcoal fires, in the face of a vast crowd. The Grand Master expired, solemnly asserting his innocence, and with his last words summoning Clement, the unjust judge, and Philip, the cruel King, to appear before the tribunal of God. Within a year they had both departed to their account.[1]

[1] M. Raynouard thus poetizes the incident :—

> Mais il est dans le ciel un tribunal auguste,
> Que le faible opprimé jamais n'implore en vain ;
> Et j'ose t'y citer, o pontife romain,

Digitized by Google

The influence of Philip had, as has been said, availed to cause his policy to be adopted in most of the nations of Europe. But this was not the case as regarded England. The influence of France counted for little here, and whatever was to be done must needs be done through the Pope, and on pretended religious grounds. Edward II. was a weak prince. Had he resembled either his father or his son, it is, perhaps, not too much to assume that the Order of the Templars would not have been disturbed in England, but left to die out by the same process which extinguished the other religious Orders. As it was, the King showed considerable resistance, and regulated his proceedings by milder and juster rules.

The first attempt made by the King of France to influence his son-in-law in this matter altogether failed. An emissary, one Bernard Palet, had been dispatched to bring the King of England to his views, but his mission was coldly received. The King of England addressed a letter to Philip in his own name, and that of his prelates and barons, declaring his amazement at the charges made, his disbelief of them, and his confidence in the Order. Nor did he confine himself to this refusal. He became the advocate of the Order against the accusations of Philip. He wrote to the Kings of Portugal, Castile, Sicily, and Aragon, urging them to protect the Order against its calumniators, and the avarice and jealousy of its enemies. He wrote to the Pope asserting the pure faith and lofty morals of the Order, and calling upon him for his powerful aid.[1] But hardly had this letter been written and dispatched when all was changed. A Bull from the Pope arrived, commanding in peremptory terms the arrest of all the Templars in England. The King at once yielded. Orders were sent to the Sheriffs throughout England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, directing the arrest of the Templars. But they were not to be treated in the way in which they had been treated in France. The persons of the Knights were to be treated with respect; an inventory of their goods was to be returned into the Exchequer. On the Wednesday after Epiphany 1308 these orders were carried out. Everywhere throughout England the Templars were arrested, and without resistance. This last fact might indicate their consciousness

> Encore quarante jours je t'y vois comparaître.
> Chacun en frémissant écoutait le grand maître.
> Mais quel étonnement, quel trouble, quel effroi,
> Quand il dit, o Philippe, o maître, o mon roi!
> Je te pardonne en vain; ta vie est condamnée.
> Au tribunal de Dieu je t'attends dans l'année.

[1] The Letters are printed in Rymer.

Digitized by Google

of innocence. Aware as they must have been of the cruelties which had been practised against their brethren in France, these Knights, strong in their fortified preceptories, and with large bodies of servitors at their disposal, nowhere opposed an arrest which they perhaps held would lead to an inquiry likely to redound to their honour. The submissiveness of the Templars may, however, have been due to a different cause. They were aware that a storm of opprobrium had been excited against the Order. They knew only too well that they were odious to the clergy. They were an exempt Order, and as such hated by the Bishops, whose jurisdiction they despised. By their chaplains they exercised spiritual functions within their own domains, and did not require the services of the clergy. They had nothing to fear from excommunications and spiritual discipline, and even an Interdict did not touch them. Like the Cistercians, they had the privilege of continuing their services in the midst of the Papal prohibitions. It was alleged against them by the clergy that their Grand Master, though a layman, did not hesitate to give absolution. Thus the clergy, and especially the friars, who were striving to obtain a monopoly in absolutions, were bitter against them, and the friars at this time had the control of the popular sentiment. A little later and the bare-footed brethren had lost a great portion of their influence, and were become the favourite subjects of popular satire; but now they were all powerful. The nobles could hardly be expected to defend an Order which despised and outshone them. There is, therefore, more than one way of explaining the quiet submission of the Templars. It may have arisen either from the consciousness of innocence or from policy. It need not in any case be regarded as the admission of guilt.

The English Templars were confined in prisons at London, Lincoln, and York. During the summer of 1308 a Bull arrived from the Pope appointing certain Commissioners to hear and try the charges made against them. The Commissioners appointed were the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of London, Chichester, and Lincoln, Deodate Abbot of Lagny, and Sicard de S. Vaur, Canon of Narbonne, Auditor of the Pope. The Commissioners were all ecclesiastics, and as such probably not exempt from the jealousy with which the Order was regarded by Churchmen. One of them, however, at least, John Dalderby, Bishop of Lincoln, was a man of singular piety and uprightness, and, from the notices of the matter

Digitized by Google

contained in his Register, we gather that he by no means liked the business on which he was employed. In fact, the way in which he shrank from the part assigned to him, and fenced with the Papal requirements, inclines us to believe that he did not believe in the guilt of the men in whose trial and condemnation he was forced to bear an unwilling part. Neither is this to be wondered at. For the results of the first examination of the English Templars held in London, October 21 (1308), at which it is probable that Bishop Dalderby was present, were as follows.[1] The Templars were interrogated whether the Chapters and Reception of the Knights were held in secret and by night; whether in these Chapters were committed any offences against Christian morals and the faith of the Church; whether they denied the Redeemer and worshipped idols; whether they held heretical opinions on any of the Sacraments. The Knights, brought one by one before the Commissioners, denied calmly, specifically, and distinctly, every one of these charges. A Chaplain of the Order, Ralph de Burton, was examined at greater length than the others, and his denials were full and specific. Then witnesses were examined; seventeen who were supposed to be most cognizant of the doings of the Templars were questioned. They were clergy, public notaries, and others. None of them had anything to allege against the Templars in support of the charges made against them. During the winter of 1308 and 1309 various examinations were held. Nothing was elicited to the prejudice of the Order. In June, the Grand Preceptor, William de la More, was specially examined on the charge of having presumed as a layman to give absolution. He explained that the form used for a peccant brother was to strike him three blows with the scourge, and then say to him 'Brother, pray to God to remit thy sins.' He had never used the form 'I absolve thee.' The Commissioners could not find anything on which to condemn the Order. Yet, urged on by pressure from the Pope, and fearing to go against his decisions, they made a sort of lame condemnation. They do not indeed give any countenance to the charge of immorality, apostasy, and magic, but they seem to assert that the charge of giving absolution is proved, as also the secresy of the receptions, and the binding members of the Order by oaths not to reveal what took place at these receptions. Certain evidence which had been tendered to them

[1] The process is given at length in Wilkins, and is carefully summarized in Milman's *Lat. Christianity*, v. 342, from which we quote.

Digitized by Google

by hostile witnesses they kept back. 'They seem,' says Dean Milman, 'to have been ashamed of it, as well they might.' One of the Commissioners at any rate did not desire to be further mixed up in the matter. At the beginning of October (1309) Bishop Dalderby sent to his brother Commissioners what is entered in his Register under the title *Excusatio*:—

'To the venerable fathers in Christ, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Bishops of London and Chichester, to the Abbot of Lagny of the Diocese of Paris, to Master Sicard de Vaur, Canon of Narbonne, John, by divine permission Bishop of Lincoln, greeting. Occupied as I am in many ways by the arduous affairs of our Church, and by the pressing needs thereof, which cannot be avoided, and hindered by the infirmities of the Body of Christ, I cannot perform the Apostolic commands with that assiduity which I could wish. Wherefore, though being ready to attend to the Inquisition against the persons and the Order of the Militia of the Temple, committed to you and to me by the Apostolic See, when I can, I desire your kindness to excuse my absence whenever I am unable to come.'

Similar excuses are entered in the Register as having been sent in the two following years (1310 and 1311). It is clear, therefore, that Bishop Dalderby deliberately withdrew from taking a part in the trial of the Templars. It is certain also that this was done after an inquiry held. For whether or no the Bishop was present at the first inquiry, held in London in October 1308, it is certain that he himself held an inquiry at Lincoln, during the earlier part of the year 1309. For we have, under the date of March 18 of that year, a letter addressed by him to his fellow-Commissioners, dated from the Old Temple (the House of the See of Lincoln in London), stating that he should be unable to be present at a meeting to be held by them for making out an inventory of the Templars' goods to be returned to the Pope, because he was obliged to be in Lincoln about the same time to conduct an examination of certain Templars there. This examination was to be held on the Monday after the Sunday on which *Lætare Hierusalem* was sung (Mid-Lent Sunday), and on succeeding Mondays as long as was required. Bishop Dalderby, therefore, had certainly enjoyed good opportunities of investigating the charges against the Templars, and he may be presumed to have also had personal knowledge of them. For a famous preceptory of theirs at Temple Bruer was within ten miles of his cathedral city. It is fair, therefore, to assume that his practical retirement from the inquiry, which was allowed to drag on its tedious length for some

Digitized by Google

three years, was due to his being satisfied in his own mind that there was 'no case.' And it is certainly not to be wondered at that any fair-minded man should have shrunk from an investigation where such testimony as the following was allowed to be produced and gravely received. One witness averred that he had heard that in the East a knight apostatized to Mohamedanism. Another had heard that, at a great banquet at York, some of the knights had worshipped a calf. Another knight had a book in his possession which contained unorthodox sentiments. Another witness, a Franciscan, had heard a chaplain of the Order say to some of the brethren, 'The devil will burn you.' Another had heard a Templar exclaim as he walked, 'Alas! that ever I was born. I must deny Christ and worship the devil.' Another Franciscan had *heard* that a Templar had killed his son for refusing to be a Templar. Another, an Augustinian, had heard that a Templar had declared that a man died like a dog and had no soul. Another witness said he had heard a sermon addressed to the Templars telling them how to get rich. Another, a Franciscan, had heard that the Order possessed four idols. At length three witnesses were found who had belonged to the Order and had left it. These men had fled away from an inquiry which was in the highest degree perilous to them. If they had been able truthfully to depose against the Order they had no temptation to fly; but having nothing really to allege against it they fled for *fear of the torture.* That the torture was applied to at least two of them there can be little doubt. Stephen Stapleridge, after making some important admissions, threw himself on the ground with tears, groans, and shrieks, imploring mercy. What could this mean but that he had been tortured to make him admit what he had done? And he now prayed that these admissions might be held to be sufficient, and that he might be tortured no more. Another, Theroldeby, declared that the Abbot of Lagny had threatened that he would make him confess before he had done with him. He had nothing to confess at first; but four days after, when his acquaintance with the Abbot of Lagny had been improved, he confessed very freely that the Templars denied Christ, and compelled all who entered their Order to do so and to spit upon the Cross. The third, a priest of the Order, dreading probably what the other had suffered, declared that he had been made to deny Christ. This was the most that could be found against the Order in England, and under these frivolous accusations the knights were kept for several years immured in prison, subjected

Digitized by Google

from time to time to vexatious examinations, while all their property was confiscated, and their Order was destroyed. It must have been some consolation to them in their great trials to hear that, after long investigations in Italy, nothing had been brought home to the prejudice of the Order, and that in each of the kingdoms of Spain the acquittal of the Order was solemn and complete. In England it can hardly be said to have been either condemned or acquitted. All those Templars who submitted themselves and made some sort of confession were absolved, but those who, conscious of innocence, refused to do this were condemned to perpetual confinement in monasteries. This sentence was passed by the Provincial Synod or Convocation of Canterbury, in July 1311. Previously to its passing the Commissioners had made their report to the Pope, and Bishop Dalderby had, in accordance with what is stated above, reported that he had been able to investigate the matter but little, but that he must be held to concur in the reports of his colleagues. The Bishop was evidently still impressed with the desire to have as little as possible to do with a process which he could not heartily approve. From further entries in his Register we are able to throw some light on the ultimate destination of the Templars and the special arrangements made for them in the monasteries to which they were consigned. The letter of Robert Winchelsea, Archbishop of Canterbury, giving the general command to all Abbots and monasteries who should be selected to receive Templars to do so, ran as follows:—

'Robert, by Divine permission Archbishop of Canterbury, to all Abbots and Priors, their Chapters and Convents, exempt and not exempt, throughout our Province, greeting. Inasmuch as the most holy father in Christ, the Lord Clement, by Divine providence, Pope, has commanded us and our suffragans by his letters apostolical to make inquiry concerning divers articles of heretical pravity, charged against certain persons of the Order of Knighthood of the Temple in our Province, and brought here before us; and that, after inquiry duly made touching the said brethren, we should in our Provincial Council pronounce on the said brethren a sentence of absolution or condemnation as justice required. And inasmuch as in the matter of the aforesaid inquiry we have by the Apostolical authority, and by that of our whole Provincial Council, 'ordained the several persons to perform a certain penance, and for that purpose to be constrained to enter certain monasteries selected for that purpose until it shall be otherwise ordained. You, therefore, all and singular, we command by our Apostolic authority, and by that of our whole Council, and by virtue of your obedience, and under the sentences of suspension excommunication and interdict to be fulminated against you and

Digitized by Google

your monasteries, if ye shall not do what we command, that ye in whose monasteries we shall have decreed the said persons to be confined should admit those persons readily and treat them kindly, and minister to them the necessaries of life as we and your Diocesans ordain. For which the Lord King of England has granted for each person four pence per day. But if ye shall refuse to obey, we have strictly commanded our venerable brethren, your Diocesans, by other letters, that as well against you the exempt (who, notwithstanding your privileges, are specially bound to obey us in this matter) as against you, the non-exempt and your monasteries, they should without delay promulgate canonically the ecclesiastical censures, and proceed according to the canonical sanctions. But concerning the manner in which we have decreed the said persons to be kept and the penance to be performed by them, ye shall be informed by your Diocesans or their vicars. Given in our Council aforesaid in London, July 15, 1311.[1]

Armed with this general authority to constrain the monasteries to do that which it was evidently expected would be a very ungrateful task to them, the diocesan Bishops proceeded at once to act. The Bishop of Lincoln forwarded to such of the monasteries in his diocese as were selected to receive Templars the letter of the Archbishop, together with a copy of another letter to himself, which named the Templar to be assigned to each selected monastery in the diocese, and the exact manner in which he was to be treated, and the penance he was to perform. This very curious document ran as follows. After reciting the general direction, it assigns John de Stoke, priest, to the Monastery of Peterborough; William de Lafford to Ramsey; William de Sawtry to Ormsby; Roger de Noreys to Croxton; Thomas de ..... to S. Albans; William de Echedon to Bourn; William Raven to Croyland; Thomas de Chamberlein to Spalding; Hugh de Tadcaster to Sempringham; William de Chelsey to Kirksted; Mauris de Newsum to Revesby; Peter de Octeringham to Leicester; William de Thorp to Thornton; Simon de Stern to S. Catherine's, Lincoln; William de Burton to Barlings; William de Pocklington to S. Andrew's, Northampton; John de Sadelescumb to Swineshead; William de Bernkell to Wardon. The letter then proceeds:—

'We therefore charge your brotherhood that you should cause the said brethren to be received in the said monasteries to perform their penance within their enclosures, causing the same to be so carefully and prudently guarded in the said monasteries that they

[1] From the Register of Bishop Dalderby, MS., Lincoln.

Digitized by Google

may be unable to stray beyond the limits to be assigned to them, and that they may be able to perform the penance enjoined to them, which is as follows :—John de Stoke, priest, William de Lafford, William de Sawtry, Roger de Noreys, Thomas de . . . . ., and William de Echedon, are to remain within the cells of the monasteries in which they are placed. They are to be so enclosed that they may not go out of the said cells except to the church or the cloister at due times, to hear the Divine offices, and once in the week to some places near, within the enclosure of the monastery, for four hours of the day, if they shall wish it, for the purpose of imbibing purer air. And the said brothers shall abstain from flesh every day except Sunday and Thursday, on which days it may be permitted to them to eat one kind of flesh meat. And on the other days (except Fridays, on which days they must fast on bread and water) it shall be lawful for them to eat of one kind of fish, which they shall choose. Moreover, those of the said brothers who have the art of reading shall every day, besides fully saying the other appointed prayers, say one portion of the Psalter, with a Litany. But those of them who have not the skill to read, besides the other prayers, shall say two hundred times the Lord's Prayer, with the Salutation of the Glorious Virgin. William de Raven, Thomas de Chamberlein, Hugh de Tadcaster, William de Chelsey, Mauris de Newsum, Peter de Octeringham, William de Thorp, Simon de Stein, shall not go out of the enclosure of the monasteries in which they are confined, except to some adjacent gardens not distant from the monastery, as the president of the monastery shall give them leave. On Mondays they shall abstain from flesh meat, and on Fridays from fish and other food, except bread, till Mass has been said ; and every week, if they have skill to read, besides the other appointed prayers, they shall say two portions of the Psalter, with a Litany ; and if they have not the skill to read, each day, besides the other appointed prayers, they shall say the Lord's Prayer and the Salutation of the Virgin one hundred and fifty times. The brothers William de Burton, William de Pocklington, John de Sadelescumb, and William de Bernkell, shall not go outside the enclosure of the monastery where they are confined, except to the adjacent gardens, not distant from the monastery, for the purpose of imbibing purer air. On Mondays they shall abstain from flesh, and on Sundays it shall be lawful for them to eat of two kinds of flesh meat ; but on other days, except Friday, on which day they must fast on bread and ale, abstaining from other food, they may eat of two sorts of fish : and all these must altogether abstain from wine. But on double feasts, which are excepted from these abstinences, it may be permitted to them to use in moderation such meats and drinks as they shall choose and be able ; also as often as there shall be need on account of any infirmities of their bodies which may arise. And the priests of the said Order must abstain from the celebration of the Divine offices. And these shall be kept in ward as aforesaid, and do penance as long as the King shall appoint. But to the brethren John [de Stoke] and William [de Lafford] ye shall do by the authority of the Council that which justice

Digitized by Google

requires to be done.[1] But for the conducting of the aforesaid brethren to the monasteries our Lord the King has promised the help of the sheriffs of the places through which they shall be conducted, and has directed briefs to the sheriffs on this matter; and to the monasteries he has promised, by the hands of the custodians of the goods of the Order of the Temple which are in his possession, to pay for each brother fourpence per day for providing them with necessaries. Now if the religious of the aforesaid monasteries shall despise your commands in this matter or neglect to obey, against them, whether exempt or not exempt, ye shall without delay fulminate ecclesiastical censures, and proceed against them with all ecclesiastical severity as justice shall require. And what ye shall do in the premisses ye shall without delay intimate to us by your letters patent.'[2]

The Bishop, in forwarding this letter to each of the monasteries concerned, merely added that such and such a Templar was assigned to the monastery addressed, and that he was to be treated in every way as the Archbishop's letter directed. The gradations of penance to the three classes mentioned in the letter are so curious, that it is worth while to draw them out for comparison. The *first*, or most guilty class, were never to go outside the *septa* of the monastery, but might spend four hours per week in its gardens. They were to eat meat only on Sundays and Thursdays, and on other days only *one* kind of fish. On Fridays they were to fast all day on bread and water. They were to say a Psalter and Litany *every day*, or Lord's Prayer and Ave two hundred times. The *second* class might go outside the *septa* to gardens adjacent, *as they got leave*. They might eat meat every day, except Mondays and Fridays; on Fridays bread and water *till Mass;* to say two Psalters and a Litany *per week*, or Lord's Prayer and Ave one hundred and fifty times. The *third* class might go outside the *septa* to gardens adjacent, *without special leave;* might eat meat every day, except Mondays and Fridays, and *on Sundays two sorts*. On Fridays they were to fast on *bread and ale*, and in addition to their meat they were allowed two sorts of fish. They had no special religious exercises prescribed. All alike might feast without stint on high festivals.

It will be admitted that these punishments were not specially severe, except perhaps that of the first class, the confinement of which must have been irksome. As to the third class of punishment, it simply provided the Templar with a

[1] John de Stoke was a priest. William de Lafford may be supposed to have been in minor orders. Hence, the secular authority was not sufficient in their cases. That of the Council is quoted.

[2] From Dalderby's Register, MS., Lincoln.

Digitized by Google

comfortable home, and left him free to do very much as he liked. Thus the treatment of the Templars in England contrasts very favourably with their horrible maltreatment in France. But at the same time, one is inclined to ask, why, if these men were not guilty, were they thus dealt with, and why was the property of their Order confiscated? That they were not guilty, in the estimation of their judges, the very lightness of their punishment seems to show. But, though the punishment may be considered light, and altogether disproportioned to the atrocity of the charges made against the Templars, supposing them to be established, even in part, nevertheless the annoyance experienced by such men as the knights of the Temple at being shut up in obscure monasteries, with no other companions save ignorant and childish monks, must have been very great. These Templars were men who had seen the world, and knew something of its pomps and pleasures, and doubtless also of its sins. They were familiar with courts and camps. They had been trained to take the greatest delight in the use of arms, and had brought all the exercises of knighthood to the highest perfection. Skilful above others in the tournay and the *mêlée*, accustomed to spend many hours of each day in the saddle practising every feat of knightly warfare, what a sad and melancholy change was it for them to be doomed to the still life of the convent, with its varying routine of petty duties and ill-mumbled services; its useless waste of life; its little cabals and secret whisperings; its absence of all manliness, vigour and reality. Despite the liberty allowed them of visiting 'adjacent gardens for purer air,' the knight, bronzed in the sun of the East, with limbs and sinews braced and knitted by the hard toils of war, must have soon withered away in this uncongenial atmosphere, and not for long have encumbered the monastery with his presence. To men also to whom honour and praise were the very breath of their nostrils, the fearful opprobrium which had fallen upon their Order; its condemnation by Kings, Popes and Councils; all the hideous calumnies which were vented against it; must have been a continual source of overpowering pain. Then the knowledge of the terrible fate which had overtaken their companions in arms, brethren with whom they had often charged side by side through the ranks of the infidels, must have been a torturing thought. In fact, it is hard to conceive a more unhappy lot than that of these knights, fallen from their proud and honoured estate, and reduced to live as pensioners at fourpence a day in obscure monasteries. And if

Digitized by Google

the monastery was hateful to the Templar, so also without doubt was, on the other hand, the Templar hateful to the monastery. That much opposition was expected from the monks to having their quiet abodes turned into State prisons was evidenced by the very ominous threats made against them in the letters of the Archbishop, if they should refuse to receive the Templars allotted to them. And that, in spite of these threats, they did in some cases rebel, and refuse the burden assigned to them, we are able to prove from the same source which has furnished the letters previously quoted.

To the monastery of S. Andrew's, Northampton, William de Pocklington had been assigned, and in due course the letter of the Bishop of Lincoln signifying this fact, and enclosing the letters given above from the Archbishop, in the name of the Provincial Synod, was dispatched to it. But S. Andrew's refused to receive the guest thus destined for it, and a letter was sent by the Society to their Diocesan, the Bishop of Lincoln, signifying their refusal. The Bishop immediately responded with a severe letter, bidding the monastery to obey at once, or take the consequences. S. Andrew's, however, still held out, so distasteful to the Prior and monks was the burden with which they were threatened. Then sharper measures were taken. The Bishop wrote to the Rural Dean of Northampton, bidding him to publish, and cause to be published in all the churches of the deanery, the excommunication of the Prior, Sub-Prior, Precentor, Cellarer, and Sacristan of the abbey. What the effect of this was does not appear from the Register, but no doubt the monastery was obliged finally to yield. And if the Templar was regarded as a burden to the Society, and his enforced presence resented, there must have been many ways of causing the ill-humour of the monks to be felt by the unfortunate prisoners. Over monasteries there was practically no efficient supervision. Great numbers of them, as all the Cistercian houses, were exempt from diocesan control altogether. Others had obtained special exemptions, or were striving for them, and in every way seeking to baffle the Bishop's visitatorial power. Any one acquainted with monastic histories will admit that the two great objects of monkish politics were to obtain exemption from episcopal control and to get possession of the advowsons of churches. The 'religious' bodies had great success in both these pursuits. Consequently a Templar forced upon a monastery, and in revenge subjected to any amount of annoyance and ill-treatment, would scarcely have any efficient protection from the Bishop, even if he were dis-

Digitized by Google

posed to afford it to him, and sad indeed must often have been the condition of these prisoners.

The Grand Order of the Knights of the Temple, once the bulwark of Christianity against the Mussulman, the delight and pride of every Christian for its noble arms-deeds against the enemies of the faith, came to an end in England, if not in blood, and torture, and flames, as in France, yet amidst sad and melancholy surroundings, amidst scandal, shame, and poverty. It is sometimes alleged as a proof of the sincerity of the process against the Templars, that the kings who prosecuted them were not enriched by the spoils of the Order, but that the estates of the Templars were given to the Knights Hospitallers. This is an entire misconception. It is true that the Knights of S. John were allowed (or rather obliged) to become possessors of the Templars' estates, but they were constrained to redeem them by large sums out of the hands of the kings who had seized them. The effect was that the Order of S. John was *impoverished*, instead of enriched, by their new acquirements. In fact, as Sismondi points out, everywhere 'before giving up these goods to the religious orders, the sovereigns universally enriched themselves by sequestering them.'[1] The Council of Vienne saved ecclesiastical propriety by ordering the correct disposal of this wealth, which had been dedicated to religious purposes. But Philip the Fair, Edward II., and the other dutiful crowned sons of the Church, had their own way of interpreting and carrying out the order of the Council. Thus barefaced and sacrilegious robbery was added to the crimes which make the fall of the Templars one of the most portentous episodes in the history of mediæval Europe.

ART. V.—DEBASED HELLENISM AND THE NEW RENAISSANCE.

1. *Socrates and the Socratic Age.* By Professor ZELLER. (London, 1868–1877).
2. *The Greek Poets.* By J. A. SYMONDS. (London, 1873 1876.)
3. *Studies in the Renaissance.* By H. A. PATER. (London, 1873–1877.)

[1] *Hist. Répub. Ital.* iii. 181.

Digitized by Google

4. *De l'Art Chrétien.* Par A. F. RIO. (Paris, 1836-55.)
5. *Mozley's University Sermon on Nature.* (London, 1876.)

WE believe the saying that 'poète manqué fait bon critique' is due to Balzac, that it was elaborated in order to annoy Sainte-Beuve, and that it effectually answered its purpose. It has done much duty of late; with most pleasing result, we think, in *Lothair*, where Mr. Phœbus says the critics are the men who have failed in art or poetry; and we remember that it there produced an effect on the daily and weekly press, like that of firing a blunderbuss into a rookery, vertically and generally. We cannot see why anybody except the first sufferer should care about it. Sainte-Beuve may have felt that a rival had, as people say now, scored off him. But to say that a man may have good literary judgment without creative or highly imaginative power ought not to hurt him. The apostles of the New Renaissance among us are good critics without the prestige or the purgation of previous failure. Mr. Symonds has shown fine poetic capacity, and Mr. Pater is safer still from the epigram, for he affects only prose, and it often rises to poetry of a somewhat charming character. Such complaint or expostulation as we may have to make about the works of one, or perhaps both, of these gentlemen may come in due time: for the present it must in fairness be said for both, that their merits as well as defects make them, perhaps against their will, representatives of a large number of supporters, to whose partially-formed ideas they give a consistence, and for whose crudities they are made responsible, sometimes without good reason. They seem to prefer the scientific observation of poetry and art for their own sake; that is to say, as a branch of knowledge, without relation to any spiritual source or present results. To their minds art is dead and finished, can produce no more mysteries, and may be analysed, autopsied, and bottled. There is no spirit of prophecy in the dead poet or painter identical with the spirit which is in the living one: there is not, for practical purposes, any spirit at all. Scientific method treats all these things as material, or lets them alone as nugatory. Again, these and other modern writers have discovered a capital method of uniting opposite advantages. They analyse and classify works of art, and so far they use the inductive method; but they do it in a highly ornamented style of considerable merit; and so combine the seductions of rhetoric with the severity of natural science. This will be found to have contributed not a little to their success, and also to have exposed them to some reasonable animadversion. It is

Digitized by Google

difficult for rhapsody to speak with authority, and as soon as it does so it is liable to serious comment.

Natural science, where it deals with Life—in the minds of all who acknowledge their own personality, and do not repudiate the sense of a spirit within them—runs necessarily to metaphysic and theology; or else to the repudiation of them both. This is true *à fortiori* of the scientific analysis of Poetry and Art. These are held to be things spiritual, by the opinion of 2,500 years; so that, if you do not think thus of them, you have, sooner or later, to say so; or you must let your audience know what you think, in any way you consider likely to please them best, or shock them least, or, in some cases, to shock them most. But if you altogether subject art and song to analysis, barring all knowledge except analytic conclusions, you do not treat them as things of the spirit, either of God or man. The assumption, therefore, to treat these subjects on the basis of observed facts, and scientifically, avowedly rejecting all considerations as to their source or purpose, is likely to bring him who makes it into collision, not with religion or theology alone, but with all spiritual thought, with all the corollaries of spiritual belief which fill men's minds. Thought, feeling, and other spiritual phenomena have hitherto been taken as facts. Now it becomes necessary for inductive science to settle what is a fact, just as it is for economic science to determine what is a pound. Professor Goldwin Smith long ago pointed out that to observe facts in mental science could not mean putting a mind on a table and looking at it through a microscope; and until this can be done, physical observation can only tell us that it cannot be done; and that all the information it has to give about the many-sided mind is negative. Accordingly, the aspect of modern literature in art and poetry may be scientific, but it is also negative. Without enunciating the formidable copyslip that All 'Able' Authors Are Avowed And Aggressive Atheists, we have to remark that a good many writers make it a condition of ability to exclude the Unknown Factor; to call for scientific verification in non-scientific matter, in the very way against which Aristotle protests *in limine*, at the very beginning of his Ethics; and in fact to speak from the agnostic standpoint. Virgil said, *a Jove principium;* and whatever they allow, they one and all repudiate that. 'It is so much better to talk about what one understands and really knows, to attempt what one can do,' and so on. So it may be; but to write as if one never could know anything about artistic inspiration as a spiritual matter,

Digitized by Google

is to write as if one certainly knew that there is no spirit, neither God, nor angel, nor soul of man.

Hellenism, therefore, considered as the scientific analysis of the Greek Spirit by its works, has an uncomfortable side for Christian minds. If the word mean, according to our older notions, knowing all you can about the inner and outer life of Greeks, with appreciation of their excellences, and without either ignoring or specially contemplating their darker traits, that is acceptable enough; but the word is often used so as to give us the impression that our old studies are being reconstructed, with a polemical or anti-theological view. A certain amount of study of the art and poetry of the Periclean-Pheidian period seems to prove to us that it was the work of Theists without revelation; and of Pantheists with the idea that Deity existed, and was in a sense to be felt, found, and apprehended, in the works of Nature. It has seemed to us that the Athenian, in particular, may be viewed in both these characters alike: in the Pheidian age and so down to the Aristotelian.[1] It seemed that the conception of right and wrong, current in the fourth and fifth centuries B.C., led men's thoughts to a just Fate; to a higher supra-Homeric Zeus; to a Father in some sense of Gods and mankind: and that the same men who thus looked for Him had notions of His being manifested in Nature, perhaps by Homeric or Hesiodic gods and demigods, and by harmless spirits of woods and waters. Thus a personal and practical Theism seems to have been reconciled with a contemplative Pantheism. With the greatest art and poetry in the world for its exponents, this heathen age is in many respects the most glorious one the world ever saw; and its history, in spite of its sorrows and visibly on-coming degradation, is delightful and ennobling. To trace degeneracy in its imaginative production is a sad and unwelcome task, and we gladly avail ourselves of Professor Zeller's *Socrates and the Socratic Age*, which discharges it with absolute efficiency. As to denying that parallel degeneracy is traceable in morals, poetry, and sculpture, it seems entirely against the facts; and degeneracy is asserted as early as Aristophanes. He was doubtless to blame for his personal enmity to Euripides; but the distinctions drawn, and illustrated with such humour in the *Ranæ*, between Æschylus and that great poet are true enough, and are held in one form or another to this day. As to sculpture, the observation that Pheidias was the carver of gods and heroes, as distinguished from later men, who represented human beauty with quite equal skill in the technique of their art, is Greek and not modern only.

[1] See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. ix. p. 136.

Digitized by Google

The connection between Athenian sculpture and the statuesque grouping of Athenian tragedy was perhaps first noted by Winckelmann and Rio. The great pageants or processions of the Panathenæa, carved on the Parthenon friezes, were one part of a service, of which grand theatric spectacle formed another; and a highly important step in modern painting has been made, by the work of the President of our Royal Academy (and his pupil, the present Oxford Slade Professor), in realizing for us some of these scenes of dedicated Beauty. It is to be regretted that no scholar has as yet seen, or at least acknowledged, the value of this art-work for students of Greek literature; and nothing can better illustrate the short-sightedness of our present competitive system, or the academical determination to know nothing save the schools. But the distinction between Pheidian work and later—even the Praxitelean—is that the former was honestly dedicated art; Beauty created, or made the most of, to the glory of the Unknown God, or Gods, or Θεῖον: whereas the later works, for centuries of equal beauty, are only meant to give pleasure, higher or lower. We do not care to call this degeneracy in art; but it is degeneracy in motive, and it will lower the aim of art and narrow its range.

In the same way, Æschylus is the poet of Gods and heroes, not in Homeric anthropomorphism, but as personating Divine Justice, Vengeance, and Mercy. 'At the bottom of all his sentiments lies reverence for the divine powers,' says Zeller; 'yet these are grouped almost monotheistically together, in his vast vision, as one almighty power.'[1]

Euripides deals with men as men: with their passions, their doubts and blindness, their casuistries of moral action: with women and their charms, their delicacy, their strength and weakness. His technique is Praxitelean: not exactly sensual, but content with human beauty, and ready to pursue it for its own sake, with Hellenic confidence in the love of

[1] 'That man mistake not his position (*Niobe*, *Fr.* 155 (154), 140 Dind. 1841); that he learn not to overrate what is human; that he be not indignant with the Gods when in affliction (Frag. 369, 358 Dind.); that his mind soar not too high, that the grain of guilt planted by pride grows to a harvest of tears (*Persæ*, 820); such is the teaching which flashes on us in every page of the poet.' Such teaching is in fact that groundwork of the submissive heart, which is necessary to the Christian faith because it is necessary to all Theism; and which the Christian faith especially produces and confirms. Imagine Byron, or Swinburne, or the modern hard-and-sharp scientific reasoners, consenting to such views. Shelley, in *Prometheus Unbound*, after conventional expressions of respect for Æschylus, complains and repudiates so lame a conclusion as the reconciliation of Prometheus and Zeus in the great trilogy.

Digitized by Google

Beauty, as its own regulative power. 'The grand poetic way of contemplating the world, the moral and religious way of looking at human life, has given place to a sceptical tone, to a decomposing reflection; to a setting forth of plain natural facts.' This is certainly true in Euripides, and it is paralleled in glyptic art, first by the desertion of sacred subject for athletes, and the Pheidian ideal for merely corporeal strength and grace; then by the taste which soon accompanied it, and employed the rhypographs in lower realism of still life and vulgar subjects, and the pornographs in directly-shameful labours. It will be noticed how the philosophic tragedian, trying to set forth the heart and the fortunes of men didactically, and to the best of his power, was free from the besetting temptation of the sculptor. Euripides was a man of high personal virtue, disturbed by the sense that many things he had heard from childhood about his Gods could not be true; the sculptors had the temptation of sensual pleasure, or of base ministry to it for others, always waiting upon them, and with increasing power and subtlety. And if Euripides, in an analysis which could not exclude human and feminine passion, incurred or was suspected of the taint of the vulgar Aphrodite, how much more the sculptor of the Venus of Cnidus or of Cos?

If you are to study human beauty, it comes to this in all ages, under all dispensations, in all states of knowledge, human or revealed, How and with what view are you to study it? What think ye of this fair creature, these muscles and sinews, colour and outline? Is its beauty that of a Temple? and of whom? Or is its beauty the unaccountable efflorescence of an unexplained compound of clay; or protoplasm and molecular movement, or what? Exactly the same question occurs to our latest school of painters, in higher or lower figure-subject; and is answered we all know how differently by different persons. Mr. Burne Jones may be said to represent the Euripidean stage of high beauty; of human passion, not without reference to the purity of the higher nature, and the Divine love; which is better than youth, or beauty, or the love of women.[1] Mr.

[1] Perhaps the most beautiful expression of this thought in our language is Miss Rossetti's

> 'And youth and beauty die.
> So be it, O our Lord, Thou God of truth:
> Better than beauty or than youth
> Are saints and angels, a glad company.'

Some of our harsher critics of Mr. D. G. Rossetti's poetry may do well to consider that his sister's work is closely related to his; and that it is well within the truth to say that her poetry has done the Anglican Church more good than ever he did, or wished, it harm.

Digitized by Google

Tennyson's poetry has always been closely related to his work, on its highest side. So in every intellectual quality might Mr. Swinburne's have been. But at present it sets before the modern world that *facilis descensus Averni* which leads through the Venus-berg. Many seem to go in thereat.

It is natural for critics of the New Renaissance to set aside Count Rio as a Christian theorist, devout dreamer, and the like. But the fact is that he was an extremely good student of ancient sculpture, and knew quite as much about the matter as a whole wilderness of minor essayists; also he had read his Tragedians as well as most of us. Now in his Introduction he says, (and nobody will deny his main facts,) that Athene represented war, wisdom, and purity severely fair; and that her attendant Amazons carried out the same idea in the human scale of being. Then he makes this curious comparison, which exactly illustrates the difference between the Pheidian view of beauty and purity and that of the French Renaissance, which is now generally adopted by our new school. Take the captive and wedded Amazon, he says: Hippolytus is her son, and Euripides the Pagan (or rather Ethnic)[1] makes his chastity, and practical martyrdom to it, the subject of a tragedy; while Racine, 'le poète Chrétien par excellence,' sympathizes with Phædra; and 'substitutes the passion of love for the passion of chastity.' So, we apprehend, without any pre-eminence in Christian devotion, would most of the male and female admirers of Madame Sara Bernhardt's impersonation of that heroine. Professor Arnold has lately, and in very beautiful language, requested Madame Bernhardt to restore the British stage: but really we think the stage and its patrons more likely to address her in the memorable words of Mr. Swinburne:—

> 'Come down and redeem us from Virtue,
> Our Lady of Pain.'

A year ago, the morality of Mr. Burne Jones's works was, we think by misadventure, impugned by the most brilliant prose writer of the day. He did good service, at any rate, in scaring a certain number of palpitating passionists; and what he said made many others ask themselves whether, on the whole, Passion intense and devouring, uncontrolled by Theism or

[1] We think it should be better remembered that the word Pagan is of comparatively late origin in the Church's vocabulary, and refers at least in its use to persons who have heard and refused to hear the Gospel-revelation.

Digitized by Google

the fear of God, is a thing to be set forth for admiration, if not imitation, in our galleries or our libraries?

Count Rio connects as counterparts the names of Sophocles and Pheidias (Introd. xiv.); and Professor Zeller suggests the same train of ideas, in making the former express the cheerful beauty of the age of Pericles, as succeeding the sterner generation of Marathon, which Æschylus (who probably fought at Salamis with his brother Ameinias) sufficiently represents. Now, only compare the old Hellenism with the new: Sophocles with Shelley, or with the Chorus of 'Atalanta in Calydon.' The keynote of Sophocles is reverence for the Gods, and illustration how their hand and laws encompass human life. Life and death also; misfortune and evil—as it afflicts man, not as it pollutes him—all is theirs also here and hereafter. And it is better (*Ant.* 71) to please those in the next world than those in this. There is guidance from the Gods (*Fr.* 834, 227, 809, 865). Resigned endurance is good (*El.* 174; *Fr.* 523, 862), though Hyllus is once made to exclaim as loudly as Shelley, because of the sufferings of those whom the Gods call their children. There is hope of personal reconciliation for the most deeply accursed (*Œd. Col.*), and Œdipus is made pure in death, though the guilt of the house of Laius works on in his ruined race. Sophocles' ideals are of men like the Theseus and women like the Fates: persons to whom life was not without God, nor death without hope.

Now our chief complaint here of modern Hellenism is that it identifies the art and poetry of an age like this with its own; claiming a common ground of Atheism, in a manner which would afflict Sophocles as much as it can the most orthodox scholar or parson of our own day. It refuses that real purport of the Pheidian sculpture, which distinguishes it from later work, Classical or Renaissance. Pheidian anatomy is not so erudite as Praxitelean; its beauty is not so soft; it is not so difficult as Michael Angelo's grand science; Rubens's Amazons or 'Fall of the Wicked' are more wonderful and horrible. The Pantheon which is for ever tumbling from the Sheldonian ceiling at Oxford on the heads of an unsuspecting Convocation may be as correct, for what we know: we never looked much at it. But it is on the Elgin sculptures chiefly, if not only, that Rio's remark is founded: that Greece alone seems to have heard with distinctness, through the din of all the ages, that God created man in His own image; that she strove to restore or rehabilitate the shattered faculties and fallen form of man, by giving to the world the notion of the Ideal. One other race with yet higher privileges,

Digitized by Google

he continues, the Hebrew, was educated in the contemplation and worship of Truth: the Greek grew up in contemplation of the Beautiful.

The theory of the nature and uses of Beauty leads, in real truth, to all the questions which make up the standing dispute between Greek and Gothic philosophy of life. We call it Greek and Gothic for brevity's sake: Professor Arnold calls it Greek and Hebraic. Naturalist and Ascetic, or Secular and Monastic, Mediæval and Renaissance, are all names for contradictory views of Life, and of Beauty as one of its pervading and unavoidable phenomena. Nobody knows what it is, but everybody knows it is there, and nearly all admit that it ought to be there; in other words, that it is good or symbolic of good. Now the Hellenic error about Beauty, seriously exaggerated by the Renaissance for reasons soon to be considered, was to pass from Beauty as symbolic of Good to Beauty as synonymous with Good. Men felt that Virtue and the Good were beautiful, and trusted therefore to their notions of moral beauty as an infallible guide into the eternally true and perfect. The error was excusable, for few or none can escape it who possess vigorous and healthy perceptions and love of Right, yet are not taught the fall, corruption, and frailty of their own souls. If man's taste for all beauty were infallibly correct, it would guide him infallibly to good; which it fails to do. If beauty were inseparable from good, many beautiful people would be much better than they are.

The subtlest, grossest and most prevailing sin of the vulgar, or modern, Renaissance is the continual issue and reissue of images of beauty fancifully complicated with criminal passion, whether lewd or furious; indeed, it sometimes affects the most skilful work of the time, and rises out of vulgarity into infamy. These combinations are not untrue to nature, in this sense of the words, that something like them does occur in human life; now, as in the fifth century B.C. But they were not the ideals of that century. Sophocles and Pheidias, contemplating only the best beauty of the best men and women, were not troubled with subtle combinations or confusion between physical beauty and vicious expression. They would have rejoiced in Botticelli's 'Zipporah' or Tintoret's 'Eve;' they would not have enjoyed or allowed Rossetti's or Burne Jones's 'Medea' so well, but would probably have joined Aristophanes in calling the picture an Εὐριπιδεῖον.

Pheidian art is a Canephorus of the Goddess of Wisdom, who is daughter of the God of all Truth; she bears the symbolic treasure called Beauty; by which the work of the Gods, and

Digitized by Google

They, or He Himself, are best known upon earth. Yet the symbol is not the God, and it may be, for a time, where He is not. The difference between the true Greek or classic sculpture and our new Renaissance is that the former would not represent any beauty in which the God evidently was not, and the latter makes such subjects its special study. Its ideal is passion, intensity, concentrated and consuming vehemence; but because such conditions do unquestionably exist, their detailed representation is called *natural*, as if diseased nature were the same thing as healthy. The French go farther, and call the elaboration of offensive detail and analytic filth by the name of naturalism. The world has taken this sort of thing as supplied, on paper and canvas, and given it its vogue. It now begins to complain, in *Punch* and elsewhere, that Beauty has fallen through with all this intensity; and that, vicious or not, long ladies in samite become monotonous, and are in fact plain. This great light at length seems to have dawned on popular criticism, that diseased expression of sinful feeling is ugly and not handsome; and the subtle confusion of which we complained a few lines back is that our passion-painters prefer to derive beauty from evil passion. Good feelings cannot be intense enough for them. It is not so much Guenevere they care for, as Guenevere's love of Lancelot. She did not look so beautiful for Arthur; or they do not care so much how she looked for him.

This is the sting of that variety of the Serpent which haunts modern Hellenism; and all we have to say of him now is, that he is not, in fact, handsome; that he does not create beauty, but spoils it; and that Pheidias and Sophocles would have been ashamed of him. *They* knew nothing about Hellenism, analysis, or anatomy, or agnosticism: they had faith enough in God and man to enjoy the beauty of all their fair land and think it in a sense Divine. They tasted it always with a steady delight, which rose now and then into mighty and creative gladness. They had no learning: they said and did for us what all our best earthly learning is about. Those who rise up against God with their science and analysis have to account for these unlearned and ignorant men and their works, as for others. We Christians say they are entirely on our side. The Faith is, among other things, an hypothesis of human life on a spiritual basis, and to the minds of its professors it really seems more likely that Zeus should have made Pheidias, and endued him with an excellent spirit of invention and execution, than that Pheidias made Zeus, apparently with hammer and chisel, but really by molecular force; and that

Digitized by Google

he was himself evolved out of sea-slime or nettle-protoplasm, even Professor Huxley does not quite know how.

The argument from Beauty to its Divine source is definitely outlined in its logical bearings by Professor Mozley in his sermon on Nature. It is, in fact, the ancient Hellenic view of Nature, put explicitly in Christian times and terms. There is, indeed, broad ground of reconciliation with the Gospel, on their own terms and by their own best aspirations, for all true lovers of the Beautiful in our own day; as there always has been. It has been our own fault, and that of the curse which is on the world in all things, high or low, that both theology and practical morality have been set against the æsthetic faculties and their great work. From the earlier Renaissance of Painting, ever since men became able to represent beauty once more, there has always been suspicion without the studios, and somewhat of a double mind within, save only with the Religious Purists. One point among others in which Sandro Botticelli's life and works are a central point in art is the disturbed conscience of his later life. Without recorded sinfulness of habit, or offence (as far as we know) by any of his works, he was all his latter days a Piagnone, or penitent follower of Savonarola. Whether any of his works were sacrificed in the Bonfires of Vanity, when Florence turned all instruments of dissipation *in fumum et cinerem*, and when many a panel and canvas may have perished: that we know not. But he is a typical person in this as well as in his consummate drawing. He felt the contradiction between the beauty of this world, and the curse that is on the world: between the beauty of women, which is the flower of all the earth, and that which makes it a poison-flower to so many.[1] But to the earlier manhood of Athens beauty was not a poison-flower in any sense; they had no strict morality to lose, no higher revelation to sin against. Pheidias had not heard and rejected the Christian Faith and its counsels of purity. And this is why all attempts at the joyous carelessness, the delighted animalism of Greek life, are mere visions of guilty folly for ourselves. We have had the Faith, its higher morality, and its higher unattainable ideal of Beauty, set before us as fully as it can be set before man. We have not, it is true, yet accomplished reconcilement between the outer Beauty and the inner, on which the Greek so deeply

[1] A note to Professor Ruskin's *Ariadne Florentina*, p. 257, gives all the author can find out about the character of this extraordinary painter, who is, in fact, the central authority and ideal master of all the higher workmen of our latest school of painting.

Digitized by Google

pondered; for which he longed; of which Pheidias wrought the visible symbols; but we have heard the fame thereof with our ears, and it is promised us in the Name of our Maker. And if we reject Him, the vision of a perfect beauty fades with all the rest of our false vision of Him. If there be a Perfect and Spiritual beauty it must be His. But we are determined to allow no beauty of the spirit, and consequently we go in for beauty of the passions. And whatever that may be like, it never can be like Pheidias. We put the adulteress in the place of the Amazon, and read Vice for Zeus, and then talk of the art of Athens and Greece. And then we find by way of reward, that the world tells us we have lost beauty altogether, and perhaps attained to intensity. People have enough of passion, and turn squeamish: the despair of wearied excitement is not beautiful any more; it is become a bore unto mankind.

We are so constructed that Beauty itself, unless it be that of the spirit, or so great as to be of quite a typical character, grows monotonous without foil or relief. It has been remarked elsewhere, that one reason for the commanding influence of Socrates over a generation of practical artists and critics was that he represented to them the Grotesque. In many respects he anticipated the Gothic character, in his oddity, in his asceticism, and in his sense of ugliness as a foil or contrast to beauty. Of all Greeks, scarcely excepting Aristophanes, he seems to have had most Gothic fun in him: to have been physically the hardest man of his time in the modern sense, yet to have reconciled severity to himself with indulgence to others, by precept and example; and that not least in the matter of strong liquors. The Greek looked for the Good through the Beautiful: here was the ugliest man in Athens or elsewhere; and Alcibiades and all men knew and felt that he was their very best. That was the real secret of his social power with the men he had to live with; there was no man like him to know and to do the concrete right, or beautiful, or whatever or whoever Right was in the abstract. He had unquestionably in him that which altogether passed show. Confessedly the Dæmon was in Socrates. And thus in one sense he is a central figure in the history of art and theology, because he reconciled and united in his own person the athletic and ascetic views of life. Both these words imply an ideal character with its own beauty; and very unlike each other the two ideals are; but the words are closely related in meaning, and one of them has been used to express the Greek, the other the Christian

Digitized by Google

view of nature and the body, and their relations to the soul of man.

The training of abstinence and the training of development do seem to admit of a point of practical reconciliation in every individual case. The frame and instruments of life must be kept fit for their appointed work. On this matter S. Paul confronts the grotesque, pathetic, indomitable Sage of earlier days; himself of weak body and contemptible presence. He speaks of severe life as athletic training for the great work of life,[1] for the Christian Race, of temperance and Sophrosyne, of self-mastery in all things. He is hardened and developed, not for actual conflict, but for an endurance involving all its trials: he cannot rejoice in his strength like the Greek, yet he can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth him. He occupies, in fact, the central or reconciling position between athlete and ascetic, between the Greeks of the Pheidian age and of the Byzantine. He cannot fell his opponent in the pancration: but he can die daily, and teach others to face death and prevail; and those not Spartans, but weaklings of ruined blood. Both these men prevailed over the chief spirits of their time. It was felt of one by worshippers of Beauty, that the inner comeliness of his spirit altogether prevailed over his ugly face and person. It was felt of the other, among worshippers of Power, that the might of the spirit that was in him prevailed as signally over his personal weakness. The Athenian Hellenes were the most beauty-loving people in the then world; they had an unhappily special taste and judgment in male beauty; and the best-beloved man in Athens, on the whole, had not a particle of it. Those who came to him for the pleasures of intellectual conflict always left him when they had had enough of it; but he retained the admiration and affection of all men who had any to bestow, from Plato to Alcibiades, and on to 'Chærephon the Bat.'[2] The spell of him was that he was the symbol and representative of the highest moral beauty then attainable, of all the best that could be learned and developed in the Pnyx and the agora, in the leaguer of Potidæa and the battle of Delium.[3] He bore witness to the truth he knew, and the immortality he hoped for; and

[1] See use of the word ὑπωπιάζω, 1 Cor. ix. 27.

[2] Χαιρεφὼν ἡ Νυκτερίς. See *Birds* of Aristophanes, 1564, Dind.: so called from his cadaverous and un-Hellenic appearance.

[3] The description in Plato's *Charmides* of Socrates, 'in the lost battle,' by no means 'borne down by the flying,' or the pursuers either, is a key to that pride in the fighting old man, and that humorous enjoyment of his ways and appearance, which seems to have become natural to his friends.

Digitized by Google

was done to death Hellenically. About 450 years after him, another strange-looking person stood on Mars Hill, below the Propylæa and the Parthenon, and all the splendours of what had been Attic religion. He came to tell Athens more of that which the other had anticipated by glimpses, and half-expounded with irony; of the Unknown God, of righteousness, of judgment, of the Son of God made man, and His forgiveness, and the resurrection of the dead; and some mocked and some delayed, and certain men clove to him and believed. Both these preachers, at all events, asserted the dominion of spirit over matter; and our agnostic physicists are wise in their generation, when they protest against education in the classical system which centres in Socrates, as well as in the Christian faith preached by Paul of Tarsus.

That the scholars of the Italian Renaissance took up the non-religious side of classical Hellenism was not their personal fault only: it is traceable, in great measure, to the state in which they found the Christian religion, and the form in which it was presented to them by the chiefs and officials of Western Christianity in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But if they thought they were better without a definite faith in God, it was not the poets and sculptors of the Periclean age who taught them that view. We think our own view of the Hellenic faith of that age more accurate than theirs, and wish to point out and appeal to one or two powerful causes in full operation in Athens and Greece, from B.C. 600, and even before, in themselves sufficient to account for the degeneracy in creed, in morality, and in aspiration in the arts, which did unquestionably take place after B.C. 400, or thereabouts.

There were two prominent causes of decline: evil relations between the sexes, with concomitant disorder of all marriage and family ties; and the universal prevalence of slavery. The æsthetic historian may glide over these as easily as he can, or let them alone altogether. Mr. Symonds dismisses Greek slavery in a short note: but nobody who wishes for any real idea of ancient Athens, beyond coins and copies, can omit to consider these two great sores of her public and private life. In our view, whatever widely or deeply degraded Greek character, did harm to Greek art work. Now, in those days, as in our own, the generally uncontrolled or degrading passions were rightly classed under the two heads of *θυμὸς* and *ἐπιθυμία*: of anger as degenerated into cruelty, and natural love as represented by sensuality. Now, it is clear—and we were taught it in our own colonies in the last cen-

Digitized by Google

tury, and have heard of it again in the American war—how the continued presence of the slave, subject to corporal punishment at will, examinable at will by torture (see Aristoph. *Ranæ*, 618 sqq.) even in courts of justice, without right of property or marriage, was a continual temptation to oppressive temper and wanton cruelty. It is equally clear that the number of female slaves contributed, with other causes, to the delirium of immorality which took possession of Greek society after the Alexandrian age. At the census of Demetrius Phalereus in Athens there were 21,000 free citizens, 10,000 metœci, 400,000 slaves (see Becker's *Charicles*, p. 356). The last were employed in trades, for the most part, and considered as capital yielding interest. In perhaps the majority of instances they were treated with personal good nature, and the Greek was most commonly a kinder master than the Roman. But the dreadful uncertainty of the slave's life, dependent on the life or circumstances of his master, is sufficiently evident, and the same all over the world: nowhere can it be better described than by Mrs. Beecher Stowe. It must have produced what we are apt to call the slavish vices in most cases; and among captives taken in war, who were of higher spirit than the born thrall, must have resulted in reckless and despairing ferocity. One of the tests under which Athenian and Spartan society so thoroughly gave way, in the Peloponnesian and all Greek wars, was that all slaves invariably ran away to the enemy, or anywhere out of reach of their masters: to Pylos, or to Deceleia, from Lacedæmon or from Athens, the serfs fled to enjoy a change of bondage at the least.[1]

For the condition of the female slave in Greece, and its result on public morality and domestic life, we beg to refer to Smith's *Dictionary*, and to a capital excursus in Becker's *Charicles*. A kindred subject is the almost Eastern state of ignorance and secluded bondage in which Athenian wives had to live; another is the consequent preference, by even the best men of the time, for the society of the educated or accomplished Hetæra; another is the consequent disrespect for their parents in which Athenian youths grew up; another is the kind of feelings entertained about them and their beauty by other men.[2] These are not, however, sufficient reasons for an historical decadence of Greece; and the fact is, the New Renaissance among ourselves is suspected of some analogous

[1] Thucyd. iv. 41, 56; vii. 26, 27.

[2] Illustrated by the beginning of Plato's *Charmides*, and by the *Symposium*.

Digitized by Google

frailties. One cannot go on condoning for ever. A gentleman of the name of Grummer, employed as a police constable during the travels of Mr. Pickwick, is described as having a vague impression that there was a smell of rum somewhere in the room he adorned by his presence; and a scent of equivocal fancy and feeling continues to haunt the advanced art-circles of our time in the same intangible way. The public is squeamish, no doubt; only then it observes that Christian painters and writers had more respect for its weaknesses than the modern school, and did not enjoy offending weak brethren so much. It begins to ask about Beauty. What beauty are you painting in man or woman? You repudiate the idea of any painting symbolic of the soul or spirit; and when you come to be compared with the great masters of the human body, to whom you try to appeal, you are totally unlike them in aim and treatment. You have before you a capital school of classical painting, in the hands of the Slade Professors, Professor Poynter, and the President of the Royal Academy, and you are superior to that; your subject is the passions, rather than the body, it seems. Can you wonder that your notions of beauty are not followed by the public, educated or half-educated? The latter section do not quite know what you are at; the former think they do. Setting aside vulgar appeals to the voluptuous, and acquitting M. Alma Tadema's realisms of evil purpose, we still notice a school of expressionists of the Unbridled. They aim at passion without check, as Angelico strove to express Divine Love without stain. Now we take leave to say that to represent passion without reference to morality is immoral; and that many modern works do invite interest in stormy licence of wrath or desire. All passion comes (as we have already said) under Aristotle's old classification of *θυμὸς* and *ἐπιθυμία*: and pictures and poetry about Medea, or Messalina, or Faustine, have one meaning, which is to set *θυμὸς* and *ἐπιθυμία* beyond the restraints of religion. Greeks did this in their latter days, and called it by the pithy name of pornography. But Pheidias and Pericles, and the public opinion of their age, would have felt much the same about it as do the clergy of our own days. To mix up dregs of Roman and French debauchery with dregs of Shelley, and call that Hellenic non-morality is absurd. Greek life did reach a stage, it is true, to which some modern works may be well suited; and it is described with much accuracy by S. Paul in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; but that was not in the Periclean age.

When any historian of literature and art, far enough from

Digitized by Google

this time to be indifferent to its mere recriminations, comes to give account of it, he will probably remark that, as the duel between Christianity and Atheism has grown better understood, the position of artists and writers, as non-religionists apart, has grown less tenable. They depend, after all, on public sympathy, and that is and will long be determined, in all intellectual subjects, by religion or irreligion. The influence of the new schools of painting, which we may call the Romantic Renaissance of Messrs. Rossetti, the Antiquarian Renaissance of M. Alma Tadema, and the Realist or Sensualist School, best represented in England by M. Tissot, has been so absolutely non-Christian, as to give a support to the negative side; and this, considering their allies in literature, we may suppose its masters intended to give. Their present effect on society is that of Atheistic pastiles: they diffuse an atmosphere of languid confusion of morals, and insensible breaking down of laws. Mr. Burne Jones has taken full freedom of subject, in representing Beauty for its own sake. But he has given so much of the depth of his soul and the height of his skill to sacred subjects, that we may well suppose his heart is where he has laid up much of its best treasure. Much of Professor Poynter's work conveys the same impression to us; and until they are against us, such men are for us.

Perhaps the great English school of landscape naturalism is as truly Hellenic or Attic as any which ever existed since Botticelli, in its sincere delight in the outer shows of nature. And in its study of nature as she is, many vexed or sceptical spirits may find refuge, and express themselves wholly without offence. Those who can bear no other message from God may try to read of Him in storm and calm, at sunrise and sunset. The appeal of natural beauty to natural religion is there, and cannot be ignored. Attend to it or not, as we will, it is still one of the pleadings in the soul's controversy; and if we disregard it, the Greeks did nothing of the kind. Their harmless pantheism saw Gods in cloud, and heard them in the wind. Modern Atheism loosens the artist's hold on nature. And speaking as habitual students of English art, we must remark that the result of its agnosticism, so far, has been to make it sometimes immoral, often empty, and very frequently vulgar. The latter frailty is, perhaps, unavoidable. In the present state of the artistic profession, as a refuge for everybody who is demonstrably fit for nothing else, a majority of aspirants can but paint what will sell, and put anything into a picture that will sell the picture. Hence the enormous quantity of nugatory furniture-pictures which hang by the

Digitized by Google

acre on our Academy walls year after year; hence the eager sacrifice of originality to mannerism, even by men capable of original work; hence the herds of parasitic imitators who are constantly exaggerating every fault of every leading painter; hence, too, the ineffable superiority to sane comment of anybody who has established a connection with the dealers. For the other fault, the fact that the fear of God is against personal evil seems established, beyond reach of the female atheists who talk us dead in magazines; and if the artist will dispense with it, he and his pictures will be so much the worse.

The chief technical difference between the Attic schools of painting and sculpture and what we call our own is that the former had principles and a high standard of work, and guild-masters, who were obeyed by their pupils. They possessed subordination and authority; and we have quite changed all that. An unlimited Lernfreiheit has many advantages, no doubt; but one of its results is anarchy in study, and copious production of the greatest nonsense for the greatest number. While Art was dedicated to the gods, a high standard of subject and attempt was a matter of course. Without such standard, objects and aims are manifold, often equivocal; and we are accordingly liable to the constantly-repeated question, What is the use of art after all: is it a good thing or a bad thing? The English public, and not the worst or dullest part of it, are always moving this previous question; and nothing makes them recur to it so much as suspicions of implied sensuality or infidelity. Whichever side they take, they dislike the equivocal, and like their virtue or their vice strong enough. All honest men on both sides repudiate broadcast temptation; and all the vigorous on both sides object to dilettantism and fiddle-faddle. If no high thoughts or aspirations are to be had out of pictures, we don't care for them as furniture. If Natural Beauty means women, may it not be left to the photographers to supply pictorial demands, and do they not do it too well already? If true art is all brush-tricks and dexterities, and this or that man's tunes in colour, what is the use of it to anybody except him and his set, and those who live by it? If one is distinctly to be on the side of the brutes against the angels, does it much matter about wall-papers, blue china, and sad-coloured curtains?

There is no doubt that, as far as a Renaissance or revival of art means general instruction in technique, we have a very good one. In our gloomier reflections on the present state of things, it should not be forgotten that forty years ago no amateur could draw, or cared to draw, at all; that the most

Digitized by Google

successful painters lived in a doubtful position at best, and that the unsuccessful starved by dozens in the pursuit of shadows. It may take a long time; but when a larger number of persons every year are taught, at least, to know what standard work in drawing is, some great general improvement must take place in technical judgment. It is one of the most subtle, yet practical, questions of our time, and time alone can answer it, how far literature and art can be made common without being made vulgar, and popularized but not degraded. The way seems obvious in both: to insist on genuine and accurate study, which can never be vulgarized, and accept none but sterling results, which have their own honour. How difficult this is we all know; yet the wide-spread teaching of our Art-Department and the affiliated schools may in time teach society to distinguish between drawing and no-drawing, which is the great first step, extending full half-way, to a matured standard of public taste.

But against all this good teaching through good work, we have the continued multiplication of all kinds of sham art manufactures, and of pictures mechanically produced; and this must act strongly in the other direction. It is not only that untaught people's money is spent, and their attention preoccupied, on bad forms and colours and stupid false ideas; it is that they and others grow wearily conscious of it; and a general indifference and contempt, against which no effort of art or letters can avail, is a natural consequence. Vulgarity in all classes depends much on idleness, and on the hope, between folly and fraud, of imposing bad work for good on the public, or even on oneself; and it is the same in all classes. Chromographs and oleographs make the poor people who buy them indifferent alike to pictures and to nature. Even good etchings and woodcuts only induce undergraduates and clerks to think they can imitate Haden or Du Maurier by scrawling on their blotting-paper. As ordinary men expect to become draughtsmen by industry, these think it can be done by force of idleness. Then people are confused by materials and vehicles and new tools and instruments, and will not think how much can be done with an HB pencil on half a sheet of white paper. Chalk, charcoal, conté, pencils and brushes big and little; pen and ink, lithograph, woodcut, lithotint, aquatint, anastatic processes, photography and all its horrors, a multitudinous palette of colours that won't hold; all manner of new dodges every day interpose between the student and his real task of steady form-drawing. Haste to be skilful is like

Digitized by Google

haste to be rich: eager to take any means except the only sure ones, which are labour and faith only.

The question has been lately asked, by Mr. Mallock, if life is worth living. Death alone can answer the question in real truth. But we would venture to suggest that the study of nature in form and colour would provide the querist with an even interest and sustained pleasantness, which might answer his question practically. It would supply him with fresh ideas of comfort, the only ideas he ever seems in want of. It is true that all is vanity: that is to say, no pursuit is without weariness; and no labour, even of the soul, can last for ever; and what we call life and living here are unquestionably not to be compared with the ideal of future existence which is set before us:—

'But the painter state of mind, like all other imaginative ἐνεργεῖαι of the spirit, is for ever new, and a fountain of youth, and an intimation of immortality. Come what will, while eyes and hand are spared, they will raise the spirit away from world's troubles. Art is one of the best of the appointed labours of the days of our vanity; it is not best, but it is good; and in all probability it involves actual types and similitudes of great realities, and has an inward teaching of its own concerning real things, which are and shall be to us when we have left the vain things. Now, as in a glass darkly; then, face to face. Certain reflections of beauty are within our power; we see them from time to time, and for a while; and if we, our sight and our spirit be anything, and not nothing, there is a Beauty and Source of all beauty behind, somewhere, of whom we are promised the Beatific Vision.'[1]

We are not too well supplied with history about Athenian artists, but we believe they thought or felt in this way. We know still less about their critics; but what incalculable light would be thrown on our view of the Greek spirit, if we could hear a few hours' conversation of that or the next age about the Parthenon and Olympian Zeus, and the difference between Pheidias and Praxiteles. Or did they *not* talk about it? Shall we dare to suggest the possibility that they did not care about it; that they were as thorough Philistines as the slowest of our noble selves? Why did Thucydides, who saw all the work done, say nothing of Athene's Temple; and very little about Athene's self, except that the Demus of Athens would have to ask her to give up the golden armour from her ivory breast, if they were hard pressed for money in the Peloponnesian War? Why did Socrates say so little; he, the son of Sophroniscus the sculptor? Why not Plato, or Aristotle, or Xenophon, or any-

[1] *Our Sketching Club*, pp. 313–15, ed. 2. Macmillan and Co., 1875.

Digitized by Google

body? The irrefragable answer is, because nobody cared much about it. Perhaps these men were too near Monotheism to care much about idols. The truth is, that in Greece, as everywhere else, the eternal prohibition holds, and the worship of the graven image ought not to be, and will do no good, spite of all special pleading about symbolism and easy worship for the uninformed. In Greece, as everywhere else, men soon felt that the idol was nothing at all. Only the contemporary generation of his own fellow-citizens could feel with Pheidias's realizations of tutelar gods and heroes. In his time and country, if ever in any, symbolic iconolatry was harmless and glorious; but, as in the Christian Church afterwards, it could not be harmless for more than a generation.

But this we know of the criticism which Pheidias cared for, that it was popular: not vulgar, but popular and general. He wanted to hear what Greece said of his Zeus. He trusted the sincerity, the reverence, and the critical eyesight and fair judgment of such an assembly as met at Olympia. It was as 'popular' as it could be in a country where all citizens were liberally educated, and all hard work done by slaves: that is to say, it was not unlike what we ourselves call the judgment of society, or the middle and upper classes. We may suppose that Pheidias had to deal with two kinds or styles of critics; skilled judgments and popular. Little can be known of the former; but we know he had rivals formidable by their great merit; and the nine or ten classes of inferior artificers (beside his own pupils and assistants) who were engaged under him, would form a large body of technical critics, alike competent and well-disposed. But it is clear that his opinion of the judgment of Greek society was much higher than that generally professed by our own minor painters for present public opinion. He determined[1] '*ῥυθμίζειν τὸ ἄγαλμα πρὸς τὸ τοῖς πλείστοις δοκοῦν, οὐ γὰρ ἠγεῖτο μικρὰν εἶναι συμβουλὴν δήμου τοσούτου.*' He literally meant to touch up the Zeus of ivory and gold, according to what people said about it. It would be impossible, in a learned or critical age, perhaps it is impossible in any age of newspapers, because they all rule different ways, and no real standard exists. When all critical opinion is written in private and published anonymously, it is irresponsible and reckless, loses sight of truth altogether, and ends in mere wrangle, like our own. Pheidias had the inestimable advantage of being able to hear the opinion of Greece with his own ears, and Greece had the equally good fortune of being deeply interested in the sculpture which did such honour to Zeus, well skilled in the

[1] *Aratra Pentelici*, p. 139.

Digitized by Google

human form, and entirely unlearned in books about form. We know nothing of the rivalries of Attic studios; but, at least, they had no press to embitter them. Pheidias was to be done to death in due time by the madness of his people; but, meanwhile, he had no little organizations of pressmen to write him up or down in dailies or weeklies.

The age of popular criticism, in the sense of dilettantism and collecting (as we in our days understand the term), begins with Rome and her conquest of Greece. Roman criticisms seem to have been at first not unlike the better part of our own, that is to say, neither insolent, nor incapable, nor profane. But such criticism depends on reading, i.e. on other men's judgment; not on skill, or that experience of the eye, and practised gaze, which is so great a part of manual skill. Pliny says[1] Pheidias was really thought to have elevated and developed religious feeling about Zeus by the Olympian Agalma ('adjecisse aliquid etiam receptæ religioni'). He has Polybius' authority for it, and Quintilian's after him. The former speaks of the effect produced on Æmilius Paullus, who as a Roman would certainly care less for images than a Greek. Ἔξεπλάγη, he says; the conqueror stood astonished, probably with sincerity, and a genuine judgment, equal to a Thete's or a Metœcus's of three centuries before. Æmilius was more impressible than Mummius in after days,[2] though both acted with honour, and paid a certain respect to Greek religion. But Æmilius had long given his own mind, and directed the studies of his children, to Greek letters; and it is a touch of nature to find him referring to the Homeric ideal, which he said the vast image made real to him. He must have been anxious to say the right thing in the right place. One can fancy the cultured Consul on his not only triumphant, but happy and beneficent, journey: lionized by Polybius, seeing all the sights which the best part of his spirit had so long looked for—with perhaps much the same feeling about Greek temples and worship which we have ourselves in Italian churches; not irreverent or unsympathizing, but of another spirit. He strides through the Altis of Olympia, in mail and gorgeous paludament, with clanking guards and observant suite, a man most haughty and honest, Rome's first general and gentleman, kind to the conquered as one loving their nation. The great doors unfold; and the reality of present power stands before its Simulacrum. He owns he is a good

[1] C. O. Muller, *De Phidiæ Vita*, p. 48.

[2] Æmilius's journey through Greece dates B.C. 167; Mummius's triumph, 145.

Digitized by Google

deal struck; but we cannot tell after all whether he spoke in good-natured acquiescence or not. It may have passed through his mind that the Olympians might be something after all; but still that they had not made their favourite Greeks either formidable or respectable; and that Mavors and the she-wolf at all events knew their business. The reverence which Mummius showed for Greek deity came very late; like many Romans, he seems to have had no idea at first that he was committing any act of special impiety in plundering temples, while he did it for the State; and it was not till after his triumph that he made a propitiatory offering to the Olympian Zeus, finding that that Deity was the Greek rendering of his own Diespiter.

Later Romans were less scrupulous than either of the first conquerors of Greece. In the first century B.C., or at the end of the second, the age of Collecting and Antiquarianism, as we said, begins, and the rules of *meum* and *tuum* in those pursuits become entirely obscured; and so they have continued to the present day, when, we believe, the race of Oldbuck's friend, the antiquary MacCribb, is by no means extinct. But Soult, and Napoleon's other plundering marshals, had plenty of classical examples to quote when they stripped convents and churches of bas-reliefs and altar-pieces.

Until the end, desolations are determined; and the spectacles of history follow each other in pitiless order, through the centuries, the same with a difference. War and patriotism, glory, creative genius, corruption, war and plunder; the treasures of the world collected by rapine within one great metropolis, and re-dispersed with vengeance in its hour of judgment. How can we wonder at despair, at reckless pleasure, or pessimism, among those who have been educated into general contemplation of the course of human existence, and are deprived of the faith which is its sole hypothesis of hope? The worst vices of Greek civilization and all the sinful side of Greek art were repeated, and if possible exaggerated, in Rome. The tendency of some of our own schools seems to be to repeat them in our own day: and some kind of protest seems advisable, not merely to exasperate those who have chosen their course, but to set before others that a really noble and healthy career in Art is open to all who will not read Atheism between the lines of the Book of Nature, but learn to study it with delight, and record it as men without revealed hope or faith had strength, for a time, to record it before them. The Greek Fathers of great Art were students, not of Passion, but of Nature; and they knew her to be the veil or mirror of the Unknown God.

Digitized by Google

ART. VI.—THE PAST AND FUTURE OF PARISH REGISTERS.

1. *Report of House of Commons on Parochial Registration.* (1833.)
2. *History of Parish Registers in England.* By J. S. BURN. Second edition. (1862.)
3. *Marriage and other Registers of Collegiate Church of S. Peter, Westminster.* Edited by Col. J. L. CHESTER. (Harleian Society, 1876.)
4. *Registers of S. Peter's, Cornhill, and other London Parishes.* (Register Section, Harleian Society.)
5. *First Book of Parish Registers of Madron, Cornwall.* By G. B. MILLETT. (Penzance, 1877.)
6. *Preservation of Parochial Registers, &c.* A Pamphlet for the Better Custody of Old Parish Registers. (Kendal, 1878.)
7. *Parish Registers: a Plea for their Preservation.* By T. P. TASWELL LANGMEAD. (1872.)
8. *Parish Registers.* Article by Mr. TASWELL LANGMEAD. (*Law Magazine and Review*: May 1878.)

FOR at least two centuries the condition of the national records at Westminster and in the Tower was felt as a reproach to our country. They were kept in dark and damp chambers, and their guardians could plead danger to health as a legitimate reason for neglecting to discharge the duties for which they were paid. Through the absence of the keepers from their posts some of the most valuable documents were conveyed, to use no harsher term, to private houses, and found in the hands of a garreteer at Spitalfields or an inferior clerk at Westminster. Even if they were preserved in suitable buildings they were not unfrequently left to lie in inextricable confusion, unarranged and unindexed. Nor can this be wondered at when we consider that most of the keepers were obliged to toil on for years with salaries always inadequate, and often never paid at all. The inclination of the younger Ryley tempted him into abandoning his practice of the law and following his father in the study of the records, only to lose his little patrimony and to die leaving not 'wherewithal to bury him.' Addison, when he succeeded, by the favour of a noble patron, to the office of keeper of the national muni-

Digitized by Google

ments at the Birmingham Tower in Ireland, petitioned for assistance in the work of examination and cataloguing. Though his requests were supported by the Lord Lieutenant himself, the salary which he deemed necessary for his purpose was reduced by a hundred pounds a year.

The present generation of historical students lives in happier days. Its knowledge of these abuses is derived from tradition, and it forgets the evils of past ages in its acquaintance with the improvements which have been effected in this century by the liberality of the State and the zeal of its servants. Antiquaries well versed in the history of the past, and skilled in the art of deciphering antique writing, have been tempted to employ their talents in arranging and transcribing the State papers, and the enquirer at the Record Office need not now ask in vain for any documents which he may desire to peruse. It is less than twenty-five years ago since the late Lord Romilly reported that the archives under his charge constituted the most complete series belonging to any nation in Europe, but that, owing to the want of proper calendars and indexes, they had long remained of comparatively little value to the historian. Since that time the labour of classifying and describing has been prosecuted without cessation, and in all the chief libraries of England may be found the familiar green-bound volumes containing the authentic materials for our country's history. The enthusiasm for preserving and diffusing the information contained in the perishable pages of ancient manuscripts has taken captive the minds of private owners. Six reports of the Royal Commission for examining the historical manuscripts in private hands have already been issued to the public, and have been received with an amount of favour rarely shown to blue-books. Fresh applications are constantly being made for the services of the gentlemen employed in reporting on these collections, and their labours will probably not cease until the task of describing the whole of the valuable documents scattered through the country shall have been brought to a successful termination.

Whilst the importance of the public muniments for historical research has been fully recognized by the rulers of the State for many years, and the knowledge of the manuscripts belonging to private owners will ere long be brought home to every student, the condition of the church registers, which are the heirlooms of every parish in England, has been but little changed, and the majority of the entries in their pages still remain unknown to the genealogist or the topographer. During the past three centuries the parish registers have touched every

Digitized by Google

class in English life, and serve to illustrate every period in English history. In the earlier volumes are entered the particulars of many local events and village customs, which but for that circumstance would never have descended to recent times. If further details of the manners and folk-lore before 1600 have not reached us, the blame must be imputed to the order at the Synod of 1597, which directed that the contents of the previous registers should be transcribed into new parchment volumes, and thus supplied the transcribers with opportunities, which they did not scruple to seize, of omitting the entries which seemed to them to have no interest in post-Reformation times. Since that date the volumes of registers have been continued without alteration as they were compiled from week to week, or at less legitimate intervals of time; and in their pages may be discerned frequent indications of the political and social changes which have occurred in England since 1600. Notwithstanding numerous alterations of dynasty, the registers of France have been maintained with unbroken regularity of system for generations past, and it must be confessed that in fulness of information they far surpass those which have been kept by the clergy of this country. An impartial comparison of the English with the French registers would bear out the truth of Mr. Burn's expression, 'It would now be more easy to make out the pedigree of a *sans-culotte* than that of a British peer.' Still, with all the defects and shortcomings of our parish registers, there is not a single pedigree of any family in England which can be proved without their corroborative assistance. Inquisitiones post mortem and heraldic visitations—the public documents which record the descents of landed estates and the successive generations of the chief county gentry—have long been discontinued, and the parish registers supply the only means of chronicling the families of the peer or the peasant: the children of the simple tillers of the soil being registered with the same fulness as the offspring of the noble families who have swayed the destinies of England. In most instances the church registers are the sole repositories of all this valuable information; but, instead of being guarded by the officers of the State against the risk of loss or falsification with the strictest care, they are frequently exposed to the danger of mutilation or destruction. Even when their value is best appreciated, and they are zealously preserved from such dangers, the entries in the older volumes, through the inevitable process of decay, are crumbling and rotting away. The loss of these registers would inflict lasting disgrace on the Government of this country, and

Digitized by Google

it will soon be necessary for Parliament to take into careful consideration the best means of securing their safe transmission to future generations, and of rendering more available for the researches of the student in genealogy or history the biographical and historical facts which are preserved in their pages alone.

Before 1538 the residents in the religious houses were the only persons in England who endeavoured to preserve the particulars of the deaths of their friends or patrons. 'Leiger book,' 'obituary,' 'register,' these were the names of a few of the books in which were noted the deaths of kings, prominent members of the Church, benefactors, and any other persons who were married or buried within the precincts of the monasteries. Several of these volumes have been printed in the transactions of literary societies, but the best known specimens may be read in the itinerary of William of Worcester. At the dissolution of the monasteries most of these manuscripts were lost through the carelessness, or destroyed through the perverseness, of the courtiers who were enriched by the property of the Church. The words of Bishop Bale derive an especial value from the fact that among the supporters of the new order of religion not one desired its supremacy more ardently than he. It was zeal for the preservation of learning that prompted him to write of the destruction of the libraries at the monasteries, 'To destroye all without consideracyon is, and wyll be unto Englande for ever, a most horryble infamy amonge the grave senyours of other nacyons.' Cromwell, as visitor-general at the dissolution of the monasteries, must have been well acquainted with the registers kept by the monks. It was either from this cause or from the information on the practice of keeping parish registers which he had acquired in his travels on the Continent, that he issued in the autumn of 1538 a set of instructions for the clergy, the 12th article in which ordered 'every parson, vicar, or curate' to provide for every church 'one book or register wherein he shall write the day and year of every wedding, christening, and burial. . . . and also there insert every person's name that shall be so wedded, christened, and buried.' In London, at all events, the minister's injunctions were obeyed, for the churchwardens' accounts of S. Margaret's, Westminster, for 1538, contain an item of *2d.* paid for a book 'to registre in the names of buryals, weddings, and christenings.' The parish, for its part, was instructed, in order to ensure the safety of the book, to provide a coffer with two keys, one for the clergyman and the other for the churchwardens. Every Sunday, should it be

Digitized by Google

necessary, the book was to be taken from the chest, and the entries for the previous week were to be inserted in the presence of the wardens. In case of default the offender was condemned in a penalty of 3*s.* 4*d.* for the repair of the church. In many parts of England, but especially in Cornwall and Devon, the changes of religion were regarded with little favour. These injunctions were coldly received by the common people, who anticipated 'somme charges more than hath byn in tymys past' as likely to follow on compulsory registration. Sir Piers Edgecumbe, who appears from his letters in the Cottonian Manuscripts at the British Museum to have been not unknown to Cromwell, communicated to him the opinions of the multitude, but the remonstrances of the Cornish knight had little influence on the mind of the all-powerful statesman. During the next sixty years several similar sets of injunctions were issued. On February 26, 1592,3, there was entered at Stationers' Hall the *Register Booke, or Applicacion of the Blanck Almanack to the True and Orderlie Keepinge of the Register Booke of Weddinges, Christeninges, and Burriales* (Arber's *Transcript*, ii. 296), and the draft of a bill for the register of marriages, christenings, and burials, which was appointed to be read a first time in the House of Lords on April 3, 1593, is among the manuscripts of the House of Lords. The last of the canons compiled at the Synod of 1597 laid down very stringent provisions for the proper keeping and safe custody of parish registers. It was ordered that a parchment volume should be provided at the cost of the parish, and that into it should be carefully transcribed all the contents of the old books. The entries inserted by the parson on week days were to be read openly in the church on the following Sunday after morning or evening prayer, and every year a copy of the fresh entries was to be sent to the diocesan registry within a month after Easter. Many facts which would probably have perished if left neglected in the old books have been preserved for our use through this order, but to it must be attributed the loss of many curious notes illustrating the manners and beliefs of our ancestors in the sixteenth century. The scribes of 1597, in carrying out this order, ruthlessly omitted the entries which seemed to the altered religious opinions of the age to savour of Romish superstition. Very few parish registers are preserved unaltered from 1538. Those of Staplehurst, in Kent, may be cited as of especial interest. They contain many prayers for the souls of departed parishioners: several valuable extracts from them are printed in the ninth volume of

Digitized by Google

the *Archæologia Cantiana.* The injunctions of 1597 are repeated in the 70th canon of 1604, with the single variation that the 'coffer' for the registers was to be furnished with three locks and keys for the use of the minister and the two churchwardens. During the Commonwealth the subject of parish registers engrossed the attention of an important 'Law Reform Committee,' whose labours resulted in an Act, which took effect from Michaelmas 1653, for solemnizing and registering marriages, and for registering births and burials. The inhabitants and householders of every parish or group of parishes were ordered to elect a lay registrar, whose duties should chiefly consist in entering in the 'book of good vellum or parchment' provided for that purpose the full particulars of the various marriages, births, and burials which occurred in his district. To this official was assigned the care of the past and future registers, and to him was entrusted the duty of publishing on three Sundays in the church, or on the market days for three weeks in the market-place, according to the wishes of the contracting parties, very complete particulars of the names and conditions of those desiring to be married. Marriage by this Act became henceforth a civil ceremony, and the functions of the clergy were transferred to the justices of the peace. In spite of the provision that no other form of marriage should be deemed valid within the commonwealth of England, the new system does not appear to have been universally adopted in country parishes. In most cases, however, the people readily adapted themselves to the new regulations, and the justice of the peace discharged his task with alacrity. There may still be seen in the remote Church of S. Gennys, on the north coast of Cornwall, the monument of a brave Parliamentary officer, with the rude poetry commencing—

> In war and peace I bore command;
> Both gowne and sword I wore—

and supposed to bear witness to his share in solemnizing these marriages. With the Restoration the clergy of the Church of England resumed their old duties, but an Act decreeing the legality of all marriages completed by the justices under the Commonwealth was one of the first measures passed by the new Parliament. During the reigns after 1688 the guardians of the public purse made several attempts to increase its contents by fining the clergy who omitted to keep their register books in order, or the parents who neglected to give notice of the birth of their children, and by imposing a stamp duty on

Digitized by Google

every entry in the registers. All these endeavours failed of their purpose, and the Acts on which they were based were gradually repealed. The imperfections of the existing means for recording the births and burials of the population of England must often have come under the notice of the members of the Government, although no attempt was made to improve the system of registration till 1812. In that year was passed that unfortunate Act which is associated with the name of Sir George Rose. The legislators of that time were rarely remarkable for a clear perception of principle or for accuracy of detail. Lord Colchester gravely notes in his diary that Muir and Palmer were removed from Scotland to Botany Bay under the authority of an Act which had been suffered to expire by effluxion of time, and adds that these unhappy sufferers were convicted for offences against an Act which had been repealed. The same dull diary says of the Parish Register Bill that it passed (May 8, 1812) 'after endless trouble with it out of the House, the Bishops having directed, and suggested, and resuggested various provisions.' The succeeding words of the chronicler, 'but not a word of debate upon it in any state,' shows the apathy of public opinion on the subject, and may perhaps account for the glaring absurdities in this disastrous specimen of domestic legislation. Be that as it may, the Parish Register Act may fairly receive a proud pre-eminence for 'slovenly inaccuracy.' Its very title became an absurdity, for it purported to include among its provisions the regulation of 'registers of births,' though no attempt had been made to obtain that information in past years, and the clause which was included in the original Bill with the object of securing such registration in the future was struck out during its progress through the House of Lords. Increased duties of a very onerous and important character were cast on the diocesan registrars, but no arrangement was made for remunerating those officials for their additional labour and responsibility. One of the sections of this Act directed that half the penalties which it inflicted on offenders should be given to the informer, and the other half either to the poor of the parish or to such charitable purposes as the bishop of the diocese might direct. But the only penalty which the Act imposed was that of transportation for fourteen years. After the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 a select committee, composed of members chosen with judicial impartiality from both sides of the House of Commons, was appointed for the purpose of enquiring into the state of the parish registers and devising an improved scheme of general registration. From Mr. Burn and Mr. Durrant

Digitized by Google

Cooper the committee ascertained the history of parochial registration in England. From the lips of many of the clergy and parish clerks in London they learnt the details of its imperfections. They gathered from the officials of the various Dissenting bodies in England the objections of the Dissenters to the existing system. They were supplied with particulars of the admirable law concerning registration which had been promulgated in France by the civil code of the first Napoleon, and with the forms of registration current in other countries, and found, to their surprise, that the system adopted in the benighted land of Spain was superior to that in England. The evidence which the committee had painfully collected and its elaborate and comprehensive report sealed the death warrant of the plan of registration then in vogue. Out of their labours grew that system which has been attended for more than forty years by such beneficent results.

The institution of parish registers in England dates, as we have stated, from 1538. The reader will have gathered from the ominous indications of the popular prejudice against Cromwell's injunctions, which were conveyed to his knowledge by Sir Piers Edgecumbe, that the clergy in many parishes found sufficient excuse for disregarding the minister's orders in the disturbed feelings of their parishioners. An investigation of all the registers in the country would probably result in the discovery that not a tenth of the number dated from the year of Cromwell's order. The clergy of the churches in the vicinity of London would be the first to know and to obey the wishes of the Court, and the date of the commencement of the registers in the suburban parishes should compare favourably with those in the rest of the country. The anonymous Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, who favoured the public two years ago with a pleasant little handbook on the historic interest and rustic beauty to be found in a circle of twelve miles round London, has taken the trouble to record the earliest dates in fifty-six parish registers. Only eight date before 1540; twenty-six others begin in the same century. Of the balance of twenty-two registers in this district the commencing years of eighteen will be found in the seventeenth century, whilst four—Chingford, Edgware, Kingsbury, and Perivale—begin no earlier than the last century. In the list of those commencing since 1600 will be found the names of many of the most important churches round London. Fulham, in spite of the presence of the venerable palace of its diocesan, possesses no register earlier than 1675; the registers of the contiguous parish of Chiswick begin three years later.

Digitized by Google

The parishes of Harrow, Hendon, and Hornsey have been deprived of the records of their inhabitants before 1653. The registers of Greenwich begin no earlier than 1616, and 1620 is the first date of the volumes relating to the parish of Putney.

How have these records perished? This is the question which naturally rises in the mind of any one who has perused these lines, and the answer is easily found. The schoolboys of the days of Aubrey used leaves of these valuable manuscripts to cover the books which they carried in their satchels to and from their schools. A pang shot through the heart of that gossiping antiquary as he remembered that with leaves torn from these priceless records of former days the gunners scoured their guns and the servants of the parson and squire stopped the bung-holes of the barrels of old ale which their masters loved. If the church registers survived the neglect of the custodians who were responsible for their preservation, it was only to fall into the tender mercies of the Parliamentarians. No one in these days will repeat the common error of former ages in assigning the destruction of all the early volumes of registers entirely to the fanaticism of the adherents of Cromwell. Still the assertion of Fuller, who never sacrificed candour to party prejudice, that during the civil war the church records suffered irreparable damage cannot be refuted. The indignation with which Bale regarded the destruction of books and manuscripts at the epoch of the Reformation was equalled by the regret of the painful author of the *Worthies of England* at the loss of the parish registers during the wars of the Cavaliers and the Roundheads. Fuller even dared to maintain 'that the wars betwixt York and Lancaster, lasting by intermission some *sixty* years, were not so destructive to church records as our modern wars in *six* years;' and Mr. Burn, in his *History of Parish Registers*, has supported Fuller's assertion by extracts from the registers of several parishes. It would be no less true were we to say that during two centuries of peace more church registers have perished than in six years of civil war. The historian of Northamptonshire, in his evidence before the Select Committee on Parochial Registration, contrasted the condition of church registers of the country as he found them in 1833 with their state in the time of his predecessor a century earlier. At that time there were in existence in Northamptonshire nine parish registers beginning in 1538; by 1833 that number had been reduced to four. In sixteen parishes out of less than eighty the old volumes had been lost or burnt in the

Digitized by Google

course of a century. Historians themselves have sometimes been suspected of the crime of borrowing and never returning these repositories of local knowledge. Dr. Jessopp, in his accurate and vivid picture of the troubles of the Roman Catholics under Elizabeth, draws attention to the unusual absence of early parish registers within a radius of a few miles round Houghton, and is led by the circumstance that extracts from their pages have been incorporated in the volumes of Collins's *History of the English Peerage* to the irresistible conclusion that their loss is due to the carelessness of that genealogist. Sir Thomas Phillipps confessed to owning the register of Somerset House Chapel, and to having purchased in 1832 the book of banns for the marriages celebrated at S. Leonard's, Shoreditch. Parts of the registers of some country parishes are now among the manuscripts of the British Museum, and the fragments of the ancient register (1598–1720) and the churchwardens' accounts (1598–1609) of the parish of Knebworth—volumes rich in references to the Lytton family—may now be seen in the library of Dr. Williams at Grafton Street. Less than ten years ago a Cornish clergyman found, in the shop of a second-hand bookseller in London, that part of the registers of Feock which dealt with the years from 1671 to 1724, and (we add it with thankfulness) instantly secured it for the vicar. Not unfrequently the public authorities of a borough have guarded their muniments with greater care than the parish priest. The municipal records of Folkestone are perfect since 1530, but the church registers before 1635 have perished. In bygone ages many of the clergy have deplored the carelessness with which their brethren have watched over the records entrusted to their care. Early in the reign of Queen Anne the matter was brought under the notice of the Parliament of the Church. In the winter of 1702,3 a committee of the Lower House of Convocation drew up a list of the ills which required to be remedied. Prominent in the list occurs the charge of carelessness in keeping registers. Parliament was so impressed with the necessity of preserving inviolably the information contained in these muniments that it imposed the punishment of death on the culprit convicted of making a false entry in a marriage register. This terrible penalty remained in force until 1819, when the committee of the House of Commons which deliberated on the reform of the criminal law recommended the substitution of transportation for life; and four years later the passing of an improved Marriage Act afforded an opportunity for carrying out the recommendations of the committee. Neither the wishes

Digitized by Google

of Convocation nor the penalties of the law could protect the registers from mutilation or falsification. Clergymen have been known to answer the enquiries of genealogists for extracts from their registers by cutting out the leaves and sending them to their correspondents. The author of the *Memorials of Barnstaple* says that the registers of that town commence from an early date, but that their value has been seriously impaired by the abstraction of numerous leaves, which probably contained interesting anecdotes and genealogical notes on the history of North Devon. Registers have been converted by parish clerks into measures for tailoring or into aids to lace-making. Mr. Baron Alderson is reported to have declared that he never saw a single book of this kind 'that was not falsified in one way or another.' Perhaps the best known instance will be found in the career of the notorious Duchess of Kingston. When that lady was desirous of destroying the evidence of her marriage with her first husband, Captain Hervey, she found it no difficult task to obtain access to the register and to tear out the leaf which recorded the painful fact. A few years later her first husband succeeded to the earldom of Bristol, when a bribe to the parish clerk enabled her to get the marriage re-entered in the book from which she had torn out the leaf. These things happened in the last century, but from the pamphlet on the *Preservation of Parochial Registers and Ecclesiastical Documents*, which is mentioned at the head of this article, similar offences have been committed in recent years. In the first sentence it is asserted that 'between thirty and forty entries in the parish registers and transcripts of Preston, Kirkham, Poulton, and Lytham, in the county of Lancaster, have been tampered with.' This statement is supported by the evidence of Mr. Edward Peacock and Mr. W. H. Turner, of the Bodleian Library, two antiquaries of indisputable eminence as experts in deciphering ancient records; and these gentlemen are of opinion that this wholesale tampering with the entries must have been effected since 1863. It is in this way that the value of these records as evidence in the law courts has, too often through the criminal carelessness of their appointed guardians, been grievously impaired. The work of mutilation and destruction is being prosecuted in other counties. During this century the old registers of Hartington, in Derbyshire, dating from 1554 to 1610, have been lost, and in two other parishes in the same county the registers have been grievously mutilated within the last ten years. Parish registers as a whole are happily free from such dangers, but even when they are carefully

Digitized by Google

guarded they are not unfrequently in danger of crumbling and rotting away through old age or damp. In the preface to the reprint of the *First Book of the Registers of Madron* Mr. Millett has quoted a previous vicar's description of its state more than half a century ago. 'Decayed, worm-eaten, and perishing' were the graphic words which described its condition in 1815, and a glance at the photograph of some of its leaves, which Mr. Millett has prefixed to his volume, will show that its state has certainly not improved since that time. The registers of Madron are a type of thousands of others scattered throughout the country. They are speeding to ruin, and, unless some effective steps are taken to prevent the destruction, a few generations only will have passed away and these records will have been lost for ever.[1]

The immense amount of information lying useless in the registers of the more important parishes of London was brought prominently under the notice of antiquaries and biographers three years ago. Genealogists and county historians for generations past have hunted in these documents for matter on which to construct the fabrics of their pedigrees, and many clergymen have printed in the transactions of local societies the entries in the volumes under their care which they deemed useful or interesting. But in the summer of 1876 there appeared for the first time, under the editorial care of Colonel Chester, a full and complete reprint of the registers of Westminster Abbey. Had the whole of England been ransacked, no records of greater importance could have been discovered; and had the entire body of English antiquaries been invited to select the most fitting of their number for the purpose of editing the volume, their suffrages would probably have been unanimous in favour of one who, though born—should we not rather say, in consequence of being born?—in the daughter land of America, has done more than any other living genealogist to illustrate the biographical history of the mother country. For many years previously Colonel Chester had spent his time in collecting the materials for annotating these registers. With that object he had copied the whole of the existing matriculation entries at the University of Oxford, and had extracted all the biographical facts relating to the illustrious dead that could be found among the

[1] Bishop Nicolson, in the *Miscellany Accounts of the Diocese of Carlisle*, which have been included in the publications of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archæological Society, says of one parish: 'The Register-Book begins at 1661. Few of those on the Borders being of an older date.' This was written nearly 180 years ago. Are most of these records now perfect since 1661?

Digitized by Google

wills of the Probate Court or the marriage licenses of the sees of Canterbury and London. The value of these researches among the records of the past was instantly recognized, and those who had engaged in similar pursuits readily acknowledged the truth of the assertion that many a line or half-line of the annotations embodied 'the concentrated result of weeks of patient research.'

The volume of the registers of Westminster Abbey was originally intended by Colonel Chester for the gratification of the friends who shared his feelings and his tastes, but a wider circulation was secured for it when the editor permitted the council of the Harleian Society to include the volume in their publications.[1] Among the distinguished antiquaries of London and the country subscribing to the funds of that Society were many who had long been impressed with the propriety of preserving in a printed form the more important collegiate and parish registers. These enthusiasts pressed upon the council the expediency of taking advantage of the public interest raised in the question by the reviews of Colonel Chester's volume to form a section for the publication of church records of abiding interest. After a brief period of doubt the council undertook the responsibility, and within a short time nearly two hundred members of the society subscribed to the 'Register Section.' Several volumes containing reprints of the registers of London parishes, and one dealing with the registers of Canterbury Cathedral, have now been presented to the subscribers. The latter volume abounds in interest for the Kentish genealogist, while many of the entries, and notably those relating to the families of Casaubon, Elstob, Somner, Du Moulin, and Bargrave, possess a value not bounded by the county. In the entries of the early years of the seventeenth century the antiquary will meet with many quaint names not to be found in the pages of Miss Yonge's history, and with frequent indications of the political and religious opinions of the day. Of the volumes relating to London we can only refer to that of S. Peter's, Cornhill. Its importance is derived from the circumstance that for many years the entries were written by a parish clerk of poetical and literary tastes. The state of the writing at the present time bears honourable testimony to the excellence of his penmanship, and the many marginal notes in Greek and Latin show him to have been an admirable specimen of an Elizabethan parish schoolmaster. There are numerous entries relating to Dutch-

[1] See an article on 'Parish Records' in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1877, vol. iii. p. 368.

Digitized by Google

men and the Dutch church in Austinfriars, as well as to civic dignitaries and charitable benefactors. In the list of donors of charities the name of Peter Heelin (buried February 21, 1601) will call to recollection the eminent Church historian of a later generation. The baptism of Katherine Woodcock in 1566 brings before the eyes the vision of the 'late espoused saint' of a still more illustrious controversialist. In 1593 the parish clerk records in Latin and English his thankfulness for the preservation of his household from the pestilence of the plague. In that year there died in London of the plague more than 15,000 persons; a few years later the same dreadful pestilence destroyed more than twice that number. If any one wishes to learn the full effects of the ravages of the plague in London in 1603, let him turn to the third volume of Mr. Arber's reprint of the registers of the Stationers' Company. S. James's Day, July 25, 1603, was selected for the coronation of the new monarch, James I. of England, but the royal festivities were interrupted by the approach of the 'pestilentiall contagion.' The striking fact that for eleven weeks after August 9, 1603, not a single work was registered at Stationers' Hall shows how plainly lamentation and mourning had claimed the city of London for their own. During these awful visitations the duty of entering in the registers the names of the corpses was scrupulously observed both in town and country. The annalist of the parish of S. Mary Overy confesses his surprise at finding that in times 'when he that wrote must have felt that in a few hours his own name might be added to the dismal list the registers are kept with the greatest care, and the entries appear minutely accurate.'

Whilst the directors of the Harleian Society were ascertaining the amount of support which its members would extend to the proposal to widen its operations by printing the registers of the chief parishes in London and the country, an antiquary in the far west was quietly occupied in copying and annotating the registers of his native parish. Mr. G. B. Millett's reprint of the *First Book of the Registers of Madron* was issued to his subscribers in the autumn of 1877. Were it deemed desirable to print the registers of the country parishes *in extenso*, it would have been impossible to have commenced such a gigantic undertaking with a specimen volume of greater merit than this. The first page of each set of entries is an exact copy of the original manuscript; afterwards the unnecessary words 'was baptized,' 'was married,' with which even so skilled an antiquary as Mr. Leveson

Digitized by Google

Gower has needlessly encumbered the pages of the reprints edited by him for the Harleian Society, have been omitted. In every other respect Mr. Millett has reproduced the whole of the particulars handed down to us in the register itself. That the parish records of Madron should throw any light on English history could scarcely have been expected by the most ardent admirer of the county of Cornwall. Not one name out of the hundreds printed in Mr. Millett's volume can be identified as playing any part in our national history; the fame of not one in a hundred had ever reached beyond the district of his birth and residence. Those who can read between the lines will, no doubt, find scattered through its pages a few indications of the feelings and manners of local life in the remote districts of England, and students will learn from the registers of Madron that the plague visited Cornwall and London with equal severity. The death rate increased tenfold in 1578 and 1647. Every family was visited by the destroyer, and in many instances an unhappy father was deprived of his whole household. But these words might be written of every parish in the southern counties, and the necessity for taking sanitary precautions against the ravages of disease is sufficiently impressed upon the minds of Englishmen already, without the whole of the existing registers in the south of England being printed to enforce the warning.[1]

A rough calculation would lead us to believe that at the present time this country is divided into more than 12,000 ecclesiastical parishes. If we deduct from this estimate the new districts, amounting to nearly 3,000, which, according to the recent report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, have been created from 1818, there would still be left more than 9,000 benefices, each possessing registers of considerable antiquity. The volumes of registers would, of course, vary in size with the number of the parishioners, and were it decided to print those records in full without discrimination and without regard to their value for literary purposes, it might be possible in a few instances to combine two or three parishes in a single volume. This gain would, however, be more than counterbalanced by the fact that the registers of many parishes in London and the chief

[1] During the last few months several gentlemen have engaged themselves in transcribing and printing local church-registers. Mr. Arthur J. Jewers has commenced publishing in parts the registers of S. Columb Major in Cornwall; the vicar of Leigh, near Manchester, has been for some time occupied in printing the old registers of that parish in his parochial magazine; and the rector of Stock, in Essex, has announced his intention to issue those of his church in monthly parts.

Digitized by Google

towns in the country would require each of them four or five volumes to itself. We may not unfairly assume, therefore, that the work of printing the registers of the 9,000 ancient benefices in England could not be completed in less than an equal number of volumes. It is obvious that a very small proportion indeed of these parish registers can be worth printing *in extenso*. Sir John Maclean, speaking with all the authority of a practised enthusiast in genealogy, has boldly asserted that in many cases 'there is not one entry in a hundred that one person in a hundred thousand or one genealogist in a hundred would care an iota about.' Only a very few antiquaries, possessed of exceptionally ardent minds, can have brought themselves to acquiesce in the proposal to burden the libraries of the kingdom with this enormous mass of printed matter, and they cannot be blind to the fact that the expense of the undertaking will prove an insurmountable hindrance to its accomplishment. What means, then, can be devised for securing the preservation of these invaluable records, and for making the information scattered through their pages more available for the literary or antiquarian student? More than once it has been suggested as a remedy for the present ills that the care of the parish registers should be transferred from the parochial clergy to the keepers of the wills at Somerset House or of the records in Fetter Lane. In a very interesting article, published in the *Law Magazine* for May 1878, Mr. Taswell Langmead, whose attention has long been drawn to the subject, proposed that all the parochial registers prior to 1813 should be brought to London, and the adoption of this suggestion would, no doubt, ensure their safe preservation to remote ages. Such a proposition, however, could not be carried into effect without provoking the opposition of large numbers of the country clergy, who would anticipate from the removal of the registers to London a considerable diminution in the fees now paid to them for extracts. The suggestion is open to grave objection on other grounds. A few years ago this branch of the subject was discussed with great vigour in the pages of *Notes and Queries*, and the opinions of many antiquaries and clergymen were elicited. It was urged by many of the contributors to that paper, and especially by Dr. Jessopp, of Norwich, that so long as these documents are kept in the districts which they chiefly concern, they are most easily available for students of local history. He referred to Davy and Blomefield in the past and Carthew in the present age as genealogists whose labours in this branch of antiquarian industry could not have been

Digitized by Google

brought to their high state of perfection had not the facilities for research been found almost at their doors. An antiquary residing in a country town can, by the kindness of the parish clergyman, spend a spare hour in extracting, without fee and without loss of time, the information in the parish registers which he is in quest of. With a half-holiday at his disposal he can, in the same easy way, prosecute his researches still further afield. Dr. Jessopp clinched the matter by observing that had he been obliged to visit London for the sake of obtaining the facts which he had collected from local muniments, the publication of his volume on the history of the English Roman Catholics in the reign of Queen Elizabeth would certainly have been postponed to an indefinite date, and possibly it might never have been published at all.

The removal of the registers to London could not but seriously affect that spirit of research which stirs the minds of the literary students throughout the country; and so much good work has recently been done in illustrating the course of local history in England that any measure which would interfere with its keener prosecution should only be adopted when all other schemes have failed. The necessity for taking some prompt action in the matter can scarcely be denied, and, whether it be deemed advisable to leave these records in the custody of their present guardians or to remove them to a central office, no time should be lost in coming to a decision. Where opinion is so warmly divided we cannot even dream of suggesting any remedy for the difficulty, which would meet with anything like unanimous acceptance. For our own part, we can only suggest that the original registers of the parishes in London, and within a radius of twelve miles around it, should be deposited in the Rolls Office in Fetter Lane. In every other case we would allow the originals to remain in the hands of the clergy, and cause a duplicate copy to be made for transmission to London. The duty of copying the earlier registers should only be entrusted to those who are conversant with the crabbed and obscure writing of their ancestors. Fortunately for literature, there is hardly a district in England, however remote from the central seats of learning, or however destitute of natural attraction, which does not contain some industrious antiquary, compelled by birth or some other accident to live within its borders. To these gentlemen the labour could be assigned with absolute safety. Their sympathies are already enlisted in the cause, and they would enter upon it with every determination to bring it to a successful end. Nor would the undertaking be attended with any serious

Digitized by Google

expense to the nation. Antiquaries are not persons keenly possessed with the desire of accumulating or spending money. Their pleasure lies in their occupation, and for an annual charge of a few thousands of pounds the task might be started in every county. In less than thirty years the originals or duplicate copies of all the parish registers in England would be found in London. This were a consummation devoutly to be wished for, and, should it ever be accomplished, the means of prosecuting biographical or genealogical research would have been brought within the reach of every student. Then, as now, the lawyer who could only prove his client's claim to property by searching the parish registers might be required to pay for the privilege; but students should be permitted to enjoy the same facilities for consulting the parish registers as they now have for examining the wills in the Probate Office. The registers should be opened free of charge to every enquirer who could convince the keeper of the records that he was desirous of using their secrets for literary purposes only.

If we are persuaded of the inexpediency of printing the registers of the parishes in the rural districts of England without the omission of those entries which are of no value either for the genealogist or for the historian, we are all the more impressed with the need of preserving and spreading abroad that portion of their contents which may aid the researches of the local or general historian. It would not be difficult, we cannot but think, to bring about this desirable result. The local antiquary, steeped in the traditions and the genealogies of the district to which he has devoted the leisure hours of many years, would find it easy, even if he had not the assistance of those useful words 'Arm.,' 'Gent.,' 'Esquire,' which are to be found in all registers, to indicate the entries which would relate to the pedigrees of the country squire or the yeoman. Could not Mr. Millett, for instance, point out with unerring accuracy every entry in the registers of Madron which the future historian of West Penwith would require to weave into his family trees, and could not Mr. Alfred Scott Gatty, who has printed and annotated the registers of Ecclesfield, in Yorkshire, perform a like service for South Yorkshire? A responsible body of working genealogists, such as might be selected from the Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries, should be charged with the duty of nominating the students of local history fitted to undertake the copying of the parish registers. These transcribers should be instructed to mark in the margin of the duplicates the entries which they deemed worthy of publication as illustrating county history. When the transcripts

Digitized by Google

had been removed to London, they should be carefully perused by gentlemen eminent for their knowledge in English literature and English history during the last three centuries. It should be their care to supervise the labour of the local transcriber, and to note the entries in the registers containing biographical information of national interest. It will, no doubt, be objected that even after the keen scrutiny of the most skilled experts many entries of considerable value will still lie neglected in the pages of these voluminous records. So much may not unreasonably be conceded; but even these objectors will not venture to deny that, although some useful facts will not be disturbed from their slumber of ages, a far greater number will be brought into the full light of day. The records of the London parishes and of the chief cities and towns (such as Bath and Norwich) in England should, as all antiquaries interested in the subject are agreed, be printed in their entirety.

A very slight acquaintance with the details of the lives of our eminent writers is needed to bring home to us the advantages which we should gain from this strict examination of our church registers. The entry of the burial of the first wife of a man in the high position of Milton has yet to be discovered. Even the eager searches of Colonel Chester have not yet unearthed that long-lost fact; and Mr. Masson can only conjecture from a passing allusion in one of Milton's political pamphlets, and from the statement of Milton's nephew, that the death of 'poor Mary Powell' occurred in May or June 1652.[1] When Mr. Bailey was amassing the materials for his biography of the genial Thomas Fuller, he made diligent search for the family name of the Church historian's first wife. All his labour was in vain. Both the lady's surname and the date of the marriage are as yet unknown to us, and the record of the marriage, if the volume of the registers which contains it shall still be in existence, is probably to be found in the registers of one of the secluded parishes of Dorsetshire or Wiltshire. Possibly it lies unknown in a register nearer at home, as was the fate for many years of the entry of Dryden's marriage. Far and wide did Malone seek for the entry of the union of Dryden and the

[1] A strange fatality seems to surround the history of Milton's wives. The burial registers of S. Margaret's, Westminster, contain a record of the burial of 'Mrs. Katherin Milton' on February 10, 1657, 58, and again on March 20 in the same year. From the language of Phillips the inference is drawn that the former date refers to Milton's wife, 'my late espoused saint,' and the last to an infant child.

Digitized by Google

imperious Lady Elizabeth Howard, and after all his vain efforts to ascertain the time and place of the marriage could only extenuate his failure to obtain the particulars by the thought that it must have occurred between May 1665 and Christmas 1666, when the fatal plague had caused all the wealthy inhabitants of London to seek for safety in the country. All this time the information which Malone passionately desired was lying unnoticed in the registers of a church which he must often have passed. The church of S. Swithin's, near London Stone, was destroyed in the great fire of 1666, but the parish books were happily saved, and 'the last leaf of a mouldering register' (these were the words of Peter Cunningham in 1850) chronicled this unfortunate marriage. If that diligent and systematic examination of the church records of England which enthusiastic antiquaries have so long looked for would not reveal the existence of many entries relating to the illustrious writers on the roll of our national literature, it would spread abroad much valuable information concerning the noble families eminent in English history during the past three centuries. A work of such importance should not be long delayed, lest the resolution to undertake it should only be arrived at when the parish registers shall have crumbled into dust.

ART. VII.—MAZARIN AND THE MINORITY OF LOUIS XIV.

1. *Histoire de France pendant la Minorité de Louis XIV.* Par A. CHERUEL, Recteur Honoraire et Inspecteur Général Honoraire de l'Université, Membre du Comité des Travaux Historiques et des Sociétés Savantes. Vols. I., II. (Paris, 1879.)
2. *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin pendant son Ministère.* Par A. CHERUEL. (1872, 1879.)

THE work of M. Cheruel, the title of which stands at the head of this article, combined with the correspondence of Cardinal Mazarin, which is also in course of publication, is perhaps the most important contribution to the history of France in the seventeenth century which has been made of late years. A history of the minority of Louis XIV. is in fact the history

Digitized by Google

of a statesman who governed France for above eighteen years; a longer period of power than has been granted to any of his successors. And the story as told by M. Cheruel is the more deserving of careful study inasmuch as he takes a very different view of the abilities and character of the Minister than has found favour with the generality of writers who have described his career. Unfortunately for the fame of Mazarin, his picture was first drawn by his personal enemies, three of whom, de Retz, de la Rochefoucauld, and Mlle. de Montpensier, have rarely been surpassed, either in lively portraiture, keen invective, or that more formidable weapon of apparent candour, which, while professing to relate bare facts with minute accuracy, contrives so to colour each incident as to give an unfavourable impression. And their lead has been followed by others, too much charmed by the skilful execution of the painter to examine with rigorous criticism the fidelity of the portrait. Accordingly, in the great majority of histories, Mazarin appears as a mere politician of almost the lowest class, time-serving, self-seeking, incapable of large views, destitute of moral and even of personal courage, still more devoid of truth and integrity, indifferent alike to the honour of his sovereign and to the prosperity of his adopted country, to every object, in short, but the indulgence of his one passion, the accumulation of money.

Yet the period of his administration presents features and a result which may fairly suggest doubts of the correctness of such a description. For the minority of Louis XIV. was far from being a time of prosperous tranquillity, during which the affairs of the State might be trusted to go on, so to say, almost without guidance. Rather, in its earlier portion it was agitated by every kind of trouble. Foreign war, court intrigue proceeding even to plots of assassination, the Parliament and metropolis in open rebellion, princes of the blood treating with and at last deserting to the national enemy, presented a combination of difficulties such as very few statesmen in any country have been called on to confront. But, as will be seen, they were all encountered and overcome. And an admirer of the Minister who successfully vanquished them has strong grounds for founding on that success his claim to a very high rank among those rulers who, by the honest and diligent exertion of eminent abilities, have promoted the power and greatness of their country.

We advisedly say power and greatness, rather than prosperity and happiness, because M. Cheruel, whose partiality

Digitized by Google

for his hero does not blind him to his defects, admits that his attention was too exclusively directed to the foreign policy of the kingdom, to the conduct of its wars or diplomatic negotiations, and that he paid far too little regard to its internal condition, to the welfare and comfort of the people, taking no notice of the abject misery to which the bulk of the working-classes in all the rural districts were reduced, but disregarding the means which might have removed or alleviated it, the development of commerce, manufactures, or agriculture (ii. 517), and by this unstatesmanlike neglect suffering all those elements of national wealth to fall into almost entire decay. As the Advocate-General, Omer Talon, described it, 'Millions of innocent souls slept on straw, they lived on bread made of oats and bran, their goods were seized by the tax-gatherer; they had, in fact, no property left but their souls, and those only because they could not be put up to auction' (ii. 500). Such, indeed, the evidence of our own Locke, and of the great Marshal Vauban, shows to have been the normal condition of the working-classes during the whole reign; or, indeed, it may be said from the time when Richelieu embarked in the Thirty Years' War till Fleury restored peace to the land, and at least showed the way to a better order of things. What is even more extraordinary, Mazarin, as M. Cheruel also points out, does not seem to have appreciated the effect which distress so deeply general was likely to have in exciting discontent, nor the degree in which it would strengthen the Parliament, always on the watch to encroach on the authority or to thwart the policy of every government.

The new authorities on which M. Cheruel relies are the Cardinal's letters, which he is publishing by rapid instalments, and also his books of memoranda (*carnets*), written partly in French and partly in Italian, which, as never having been designed to meet any eye but the writer's own, M. Cheruel naturally regards as furnishing irrefragable proof of his real feelings and aims, and disproving many of the charges with which historians have loaded the Cardinal's memory; as, to take a single instance of great importance, that of having obstructed the negotiations at Münster, and having endeavoured to protract the war which for thirty years had wasted the Continent from Lisbon to Dresden. The Cardinal's papers which M. Cheruel is now bringing to light conclusively show that he resisted nothing but the introduction of some articles in the treaty which he felt to be disadvantageous to France (ii. 478). Like more modern statesmen, he felt that 'peace with honour' could be the only desirable, because the only durable, peace.

Digitized by Google

And M. Cheruel quotes with natural satisfaction the testimony which 'the learned archivist of the Hague, M. Groen van Prinsterex,' has drawn from the archives of the House of Orange-Nassau to the sincerity and success of his endeavours to terminate the war (ii. 487).

If he be the most skilful historian who best succeeds in imbuing himself with the feelings of the age which he is describing, M. Cheruel certainly does so in one point; since he has so fully adopted the creed of Louis's Court, that all princes of Royal blood are heaven-born generals, that he not only seems to assume as an admitted fact the military superiority of Condé to Turenne, a preference which we shall be curious to see how he justifies when he comes to examine the campaigns of 1653–6, but at times even gives credit for displays of energy and ability to the most contemptible of all the princes who ever bore that unhonoured title, Gaston, Duke of Orléans.

With this preface, we will now endeavour to give our readers a brief sketch of the history of the first five years of this most important reign (from May 1643 to June 1648), with the new lights thrown upon it by the researches of M. Cheruel among the important documents which we have mentioned, but which were unknown to his predecessors, whether contemporaries like de Retz or Madame de Motteville, or to more recent writers like Sismondi and Martin.

Louis XIII. died on May 14, 1643. Rarely has a sovereign sat upon any throne with fewer good qualities to counterbalance his defects; and it shows in a singular manner the spirit of extravagant loyalty to Royal blood which governs M. Cheruel, that he speaks of that weak-minded, suspicious, treacherous, cruel tyrant with uniform respect, even attributing to him warlike valour (xxxiii.), military judgment (i. 9), and an ardent spirit of devotion (i. 17). The King's malignant jealousy of temper had even led him to endeavour to embarrass the government after his death by fettering the Queen, to whom he could not avoid bequeathing the regency, by limitations to her authority, for which there was no precedent, and by the appointment of a Council, to whose control she was in many cases to be subjected. She on her part had been, we may almost say, driven into a course of duplicity by his arrangements, to which she had agreed during his life, but which she was resolved to overturn the moment that he should be dead. But her measures for emancipating herself from them showed the same impolitic willingness to employ the encroaching spirit of the Parisian Parliament for

Digitized by Google

her temporary objects to which previous sovereigns had often yielded, but which none of them had had equal reason to repent. In her eagerness for undivided authority she condescended to submit the provisions of her husband's will to the judgment of the Parliament, and to receive from that body that investment with supreme power during the minority of her son which it certainly had no legal or constitutional right to confer, and for which she might have better trusted to uniform precedent, and even to the good sense of the Council itself which Louis XIII. had pretended to create for her guidance. Omer Talon, the Advocate-General, whom she employed as her chief agent in managing the Parliament, had compared her to Blanche of Castile (i. 34), meaning, we may conceive, to intimate a hope that the reign now about to begin might resemble that of the great sovereign whom four hundred years before the guardianship of a conscientious and wise mother had so singularly fitted for government. He had not anticipated that the first use which she would make of her authority would be the confirmation of Mazarin in his office of Prime Minister. But the very next day an event took place well calculated to make the appointment of the Cardinal acceptable to the army, and to the great majority of the nation, ever above all things jealous of its military glory. One of Mazarin's last acts as Minister of Louis XIII. had been the nomination of the youthful Duke d'Enghien to the chief command of the army on the Flemish frontier. And on the 19th of May the young prince, fortune singularly aiding his reckless valour, had achieved the great victory of Rocroi, and by that single exploit had gained the credit of establishing the superiority of the French soldiery to that of the Spaniard, which, from the days of Gonsalvo, the Great Captain, had enjoyed an undisputed pre-eminence over every army on the Continent.

But it was not on the frontier, but in Paris, and not against the foreign enemy, but against domestic rivals for Court favours, that the Cardinal had need to arm himself. Had they not been divided by mutual jealousies, he could hardly have maintained his ground. But, though the leaders of the different parties were closely related, their divisions at first prevented them from co-operating in any system of policy, or even of intrigue, and for some time enabled him to play one against another, so as to defeat them all. The Duke of Orléans was the King's uncle; the Prince of Condé was his cousin; the Duke of Beaufort, as a grandson, though illegitimate, of Henri IV., was also his cousin. But

Digitized by Google

d'Orléans protested against the arrogance of Condé; Condé and his son d'Enghien sneered at the incapacity of Beaufort, which was indeed sufficiently notorious; and Mazarin has rarely been surpassed in the art of availing himself of the weaknesses of foes, and of playing one against another. His first danger came from Beaufort, in whose schemes political ambition, if indeed he was ever seriously influenced by so respectable a motive, was subordinate to personal vanity. He was, or considered himself, extremely handsome; he piqued himself on his successes in gallantry; and as, in the first hours of agitation which followed on the death of the late King, the Queen had entrusted her children to his protection, he flattered himself that she also was not insensible to his charms, and that he should find it easy to obtain an influence over her heart which would secure him the chief authority in the State. To such hopes the confirmation of Mazarin as Minister was a fatal blow, since it was soon seen that his ascendency was not confined to politics, but that his grace of manner and insinuating address had made him as attractive to Anne as a companion, as his acuteness, his fertility of resource, and intimate knowledge of affairs, foreign as well as domestic, rendered him indispensable as an adviser. The preference thus shown for him Beaufort resented as an injury to himself, and he determined on revenge. He had a band of adherents who, in reliance on the ascendency which, as they flattered themselves, the Queen's partiality would secure him, had given themselves such airs that the Parisians, with their ready wit at inventing nicknames, distinguished them as 'les Importants;' just as, a few months later, we shall see that they styled a similar band, who attached themselves to d'Enghien, as 'les Petits Maîtres.' These acquiesced in the title, and, at their leader's bidding, were willing to establish his and their importance by the assassination of the Cardinal. But they could not keep their own secret. Mazarin was warned of his danger; and, as the Queen fully shared his resentment at the plot, he showed his consciousness of his strength by striking at the head of the conspiracy. He arrested Beaufort himself, and imprisoned him at Vincennes, and at the same time banished his parents, the Duke and Duchess of Vendôme, from Paris. Paris is a place in which bold measures always succeed; and no act of boldness was ever more successful. Even the Coadjutor, than whom no contemporary was less inclined to speak well of the Cardinal's measures, could not conceal his admiration at so vigorous a step. It was a display of strength

Digitized by Google

which dazzled the more from being unexpected. After the arrest of so great a prince, to quote the words of de Retz himself, every one who was left untouched thought himself personally obliged to the Minister for his liberty. His unruffled courtesy to every one else seconded the favourable impression; and so, as by the touch of an enchanter's wand, 'all the world became in a moment Mazarin.'

He had need of all his popularity, for he was surrounded by far more serious difficulties than those which had their source in the intrigues or plots of courtiers; financial embarrassments, which often perplex the wisest ministers in the best governed States, against which, under the first Bourbon, Sully himself had struggled with but qualified success, and which eventually became the chief cause of the downfall of the last. The part in the Thirty Years' War which had been Richelieu's legacy had strained the resources of the State to the uttermost, and the facility of the Queen, which her flatterers called her goodness, but which M. Cheruel more correctly brands as weakness, in a few weeks entirely exhausted the treasury. M. Cheruel quotes the correspondence of a contemporary, 'the caustic Guy Patin,' for the statement that in the first month of the reign she gave away six millions (i. 121), or above a quarter of a million sterling. And the mischief of this prodigality threatened such danger that, in spite of his fear of giving offence before habit had given stability to his influence, Mazarin could not refrain from addressing her an earnest and, it must be owned, a well-timed remonstrance. He warned her that such indiscriminate liberality was calling into existence factions which it might become impossible to extinguish; that the spirit of the French people was so encroaching that, 'if they were allowed to take one step, they were sure to try and make it four;' and, appealing to her affection for her child, he urged 'that, when he should be old enough to rule, nothing would grieve him more than to find himself, successor as he was of a king who had been entirely absolute, dependent for his authority on his subjects.' And, with a statesmanlike appreciation of the position which every sovereign ought to choose, he pointed out that it was 'not her part to espouse the side of any one faction. She should be the mistress and judge of all, without displaying partiality for any' (i. 123).

In dealing with another difficulty, only second in importance to the financial one, he was able to act on his own judgment unembarrassed by any extraneous circumstances. And his success in managing it was as creditable to his temper

Digitized by Google

as to his sagacity. The Huguenots were still a numerous and powerful body; and they not unnaturally thought the minority of the sovereign presented a favourable opportunity for recovering some of the privileges which had been granted to them by Henri IV., but which had been wrested from them by Richelieu (i. 125). Riots took place in some districts, and fierce conflicts between the Roman Catholics and the Huguenots even in the suburbs of the capital. And Mazarin's anxiety was increased by the circumstance that many of the most distinguished soldiers in the kingdom preferred what was still called the new religion. The Maréchal de Châtillon and Gassion were of the number; but the most formidable of all was Turenne, who by his services in Italy had already established a reputation second to that of no other commander. And the Cardinal's description of him at this crisis, as preserved in one of his memoranda,[1] is worth considering in connexion with his changeable and inconsistent conduct during the Fronde; conduct which has generally been attributed to personal motives arising out of the desire of his brother the Duc de Bouillon to recover Sedan, which Richelieu had compelled him to cede; but which, in the view of Mazarin, had its source in his own position as a leader of the Huguenots:—

'In Richelieu's time he was the humblest and most accommodating of men, but now he is full of cavils and complaints. Men in general think, and he himself thinks too, that the entire Protestant party regard him as the rising sun, and as a man called by heaven to re-establish the Huguenots in all their former brilliancy. His Majesty has given him reason to hope for the bâton of Maréchal of France; but, in spite of this, he is ever restless. There has been an idea, for his own interest, of sending him with an army to Italy .... But he talks even of the command which he has at present as a great favour which he is doing the Queen by taking. This year he has received from the King, in extraordinary gratifications, not less than 30,000 livres, and still he complains, forgetting that in past times he received nothing, and yet praised the manner in which Cardinal Richelieu treated him. It is necessary to watch him very carefully, for undoubtedly he cherishes great designs'—(i. 129).

The danger from Turenne was not imaginary; for Mazarin never suspected that it would be possible to make a proselyte of him as he made of Châtillon, a success which was reserved for the King himself in later years. But he trusted to his own firmness, patience, and tolerant spirit to avert the peril. And these are qualities which rarely fail to gain their ends. Nor

[1] Vol. i. 128, quoting the third 'carnet.'

Digitized by Google

did they fail now. While he showed himself resolute in repressing disorders, he gave the Huguenots full security for the peaceful exercise of their religion. He instructed the officers of the Chamber 'of the Edict'[1] that 'the Queen made no distinction between the loyal subjects of the King her son.' And he besought the co-operation of the old Duke de la Force, one of the companions in arms of Henri IV., who, though nearly ninety years of age, still preserved much of his ancient energy, to aid him in tranquillizing the minds of his brother Protestants by

'assuring them of the good disposition entertained towards them by the Queen. Time, he said, would prove to them that she would protect and honour without any distinction all those who, whatever might be their religion, should show an emulous desire to render to the King the obedience which was his due . . . . . The success of the government in its foreign policy, and the re-establishment of peace which was indispensable to the welfare of the people, depended on the concord of all Frenchmen, and to promote such concord was the duty of all true lovers of their country'—(i. 131).

His policy was far from meeting the approval of all the courtiers. Another of his memoranda records that Condé was constantly urging the Queen to persecute the reformed religion. But Mazarin's influence with Anne enabled him to overbear such mischievous counsels; and his moderation met its reward when, four years afterwards, the rebellion of the Fronde broke out, and in spite of the disloyal aid which at one time it obtained from Turenne the Huguenots as a body ranged themselves throughout on the side of the government. Even the war, which in these its last years was carried on energetically in no quarter except where the French armies were engaged, added to the popularity of the Cardinal by the victories which marked its progress. One of the few naval triumphs which embellish the history of the nation was gained in the autumn of 1643, when the young Admiral de Brezé followed up a successful action off Rosas by the entire destruction of the Spanish fleet at Carthagena. But the chief weight of the contest fell, as was natural, on the army which was engaged on the Rhine, where Marshal Guebriant, an officer of whom Mazarin deservedly entertained the very highest opinion (i. 20), held the chief command. Unfortunately, however, he was mortally wounded by a chance shot at the siege of Rottweil, and, while he was lingering on his

[1] A chamber of the Parliament created by Henri IV. One of the provisions of the 'Edict' of Nantes for the trial of cases in which Huguenots were concerned.

Digitized by Google

death-bed, the great Bavarian General Mercy fell on Rantzau, who had succeeded to the command, at Deutlingen, and inflicted on him a defeat as decisive as even Rocroi.[1]

It is no small praise of Mazarin to say that he never appears to greater advantage than in times of disaster such as this. He did not for a moment blind himself to its gravity (i. 260), but he took steps to remedy it with promptitude and sagacity. Though, as we have seen, not without some reasons to entertain distrust of Turenne, he did not allow that feeling to weigh against his conviction of his pre-eminent abilities, but transferred him from Italy, where his exploits had already made his further service there needless, to the command so unhappily rendered vacant in Germany. Nor did he show greater judgment in the selection of his commanders than in the discretion which he allowed them for the conduct of their operations, which stands in striking contrast to the manner in which the Emperor's ministers controlled their great soldiers. While Montecuculi, the Duke of Lorraine, and Prince Eugène were unable to plan a single manœuvre or direct a single movement without the risk of being put to shame before their army and their country by the countermanding of their orders by the Aulic Council, Mazarin writes to Guebriant:—

'You are to keep before your eyes as the immovable foundation of your conduct that its principal object, and that which is to regulate all, is the general success of our affairs in Germany. There lies the solidity and essence of your employment, to which everything else is subordinate, and but an accessory. And therefore I send you no particular order, because you can judge better than any one else; and we have full confidence in your capacity and your zeal'—(i. 101).

And again:

'you who are on the spot must be able to judge better what should be done than we who are at a distance'—(i. 257).[2]

[1] 7,000 prisoners were taken, among whom were Rantzau himself and four other French generals. The battle was fought Nov. 21, 1643 (i. 258).

[2] In his letters Nelson more than once lays down this principle as his own rule of conduct. 'To say that an officer is never, for any object, to alter his orders is what I cannot comprehend. The circumstances of the war so often vary that an officer has almost every moment to consider "what would my superiors direct, did they know what is passing under my nose?"'—Letter to Lord Spencer, First Lord of the Admiralty, Nov. 1799, Nelson's *Despatches*, iv. 90. And again, 'I find few think as I do; but to obey orders is all perfection. To serve my King and to destroy the French I consider as the great order of all, from which little ones spring; and if one of these little ones militate against it (for who can tell exactly at a distance?), I go back to obey the great order and object—to *down*,

Digitized by Google

The letters to Rantzau and d'Enghien are conceived in the same spirit. On one occasion, when urging the Duke to profit by a past success to undertake some fresh enterprise, he leaves it to his decision what that enterprise shall be, adding that, for whatever he may decide on, he himself will bear all the responsibility. We need seek for no other explanation of the constant superiority of the French arms in their conflicts with the Empire to the end of the century than is furnished by the difference between the conduct in this respect of the French and Imperial Ministers.

In his letters Mazarin gives great credit to the Queen Regent for 'the firmness and constancy, beyond that of her sex, with which she resolved to spare neither men nor money' in the cause on which she was embarked; and which she showed in providing Turenne with 'larger reinforcements of cavalry and infantry, and with ample supplies of money to purchase provisions and all other necessaries.'[1] For the shameful maxim that war should support war, and that an army should be fed at the expense of the country in which it was acting, had not yet been avowed by the rulers of any country. But while thus putting forth increased strength in these last years of the great struggle, we learn from others of his letters that, in encouraging the Queen to this display of resolution, it was peace not warlike triumphs for which he was anxious; and that he was carrying out the old proverb, 'If you would have peace, arm yourself for war.' For in the same month he was furnishing instructions to M. d'Avaux and M. Servien, whom he appointed to represent France at Münster in Westphalia, where already a Congress was appointed to meet to treat of the terms on which peace might be restored to Europe; and was beginning a correspondence with the representatives of foreign, and especially of the Protestant, Powers, with the view of inducing them to unite with him in thoroughly harmonious co-operation both in his military and his diplomatic measures. But the jarring claims of so many nations were not as easily reconciled as he apparently had hoped; and several more years of exhausting warfare were still to be endured, and many sanguinary battles were to be fought, in which the advantage was not always on the side of France, before the re-establishment

down with the French villains'—Letter to the Duke of Clarence, *ib.* 95. The principle is the same in every war; but the Ministers have been very few, if any, who have had the temper and wisdom to see and act on it as Mazarin did.

[1] Letters, i. 479 *seq.*; quoted by Cheruel, i. 262.

Digitized by Google

of peace, which, so far as France was concerned, was even then but partial and temporary.

Nor was it only in supplying his own generals that Mazarin was liberal. The beginning of 1644 witnessed the conclusion of a treaty with the Dutch Republic, by which France became the paymaster of the alliance, and bound herself to furnish large subsidies to enable Holland to keep her forces in the field. He attached the greater importance to this alliance with the Dutch, that he desired to make the Flemish frontier the scene of the principal operations in the coming campaign; though some of his arrangements for them show in a singular degree the extent to which he was hampered by the intrigues of the Court and the rivalry of the different princes. He could not as yet suspect the baseness of which d'Enghien afterwards proved himself capable when he openly bore arms in the service of the enemies of his country; but he saw that his success at Rocroi had inflamed his natural arrogance and violence of disposition to a degree that threatened to make his military skill not less dangerous than useless to the State. His apprehensions of mischief from the Duke's presumption were well founded; but it was a strange expedient to which he had resource to humble the pride of the young conqueror, since it was the appointment to the command on the frontier of a prince who was indeed superior in rank to d'Enghien, but who also had in more than one instance shown himself utterly destitute, not only of military skill, but even of ordinary courage, and still more devoid of truth and honour, the Duke of Orléans, the betrayer of Montmorenci. There is nothing in M. Cheruel's two volumes so strange as that he should permit himself to speak of the Duke's 'succès militaires' (i. 274). In vain d'Enghien remonstrated, and even threatened. The Minister was resolute; and the victor of Rocroi was forced to content himself with the command of a force scarcely exceeding 10,000 men,[1] with which to cover the sieges which d'Orléans and his lieutenants Gassion, la Meilleraye, and Rantzau were furnished with a far larger army to conduct to a successful issue. To a certain extent Mazarin's plans succeeded. Gassion took Fort Philip and Gravelines, a town whose position on the coast rendered it of great importance; but the achievement served only to exasperate the jealousy of d'Enghien and his father, and, since it could not be pretended that d'Orléans himself had any

[1] His army is stated in one of the Cardinal's letters (i. 678) at 8,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry. That of the Duke of Orléans at 18,000 infantry and 6,000 cavalry.

Digitized by Google

share in it, enabled them to impeach more plausibly than before the Duke's fitness for command; and many weeks did not elapse before a brilliant, though not very well deserved, victory gained by d'Enghien gave keener point to their sarcasms, by the contrast it afforded to the inactivity of d'Orléans. In the early part of the summer Turenne commanded a small force in Bavaria, with which he crossed the Rhine, and defeated more than one division of the Imperial forces, though he could not prevent the Comte de Mercy, who was probably the ablest general on the side of the Imperialists that the whole war had produced, and whose force nearly doubled his own, from taking Fribourg. But it had scarcely fallen when d'Enghien, whose presence seemed no longer required on the Flemish frontier, brought his division to reinforce Turenne, or rather to take the command of their united armies, in compliance with the absurd principle established at the French Court, that Royal blood, however unaccompanied by experience, qualified him who could boast of it for the supreme command in preference to the ablest generals.

The junction of the two divisions gave the French as great a numerical superiority as Mercy had previously enjoyed. And d'Enghien resolved to employ it to recover the fortress which had just been lost. Had not his subordinate Marshals Turenne and de Grammont been more skilful than himself his attempt would have had a most disastrous issue. Mercy, pre-eminently skilful in choosing ground for a battle, had taken a position so strong as to counterbalance the French superiority in numbers. But when, though it might perhaps have been turned, d'Enghien, in spite of the warnings of Turenne, endeavoured to force it by an attack in front, he lost such numbers of his men, that, had it not been for de Grammont's masterly handling of the cavalry, he must have been entirely routed. Whatever reckless hardihood could do he did. It is said that on one occasion he threw his Marshal's staff among the enemy's ranks, and bade his men, for shame's sake, recover it and not leave it as a trophy to the enemy.[1] Nothing is so contagious as audacity, except perhaps fear. The belief which he implied in the invincibility of his men made them invincible. They brought him back his staff, and at last, after two days' of hard fighting, Mercy was compelled to fall back and retreat towards the Black Forest. His loss of men had been far inferior to that of the French; but the pos-

[1] *Essai sur la vie du grand Condé.* Par Louis Joseph de Bourbon-Condé, p. 29.

Digitized by Google

session of the field of battle gave d'Enghien not only the appearance but the fruits of victory.

Vain-glorious as the Duke was, he was not more elated at these successes than the Minister; who began to contemplate the possibility of carrying out the plans suggested to him at the beginning of the year by Guebriant and Turenne, of conquering the entire Palatinate: with the view not of keeping it, but of marking in the most undeniable manner the triumph of France over the Empire, and restoring it to its ancient masters. There were strong military reasons, too, for desiring the conquest, since the garrisons with which the Duke of Lorraine occupied some of the principal fortresses in the Palatinate were a standing menace to the French armies, both from their own position, and from the means which they afforded of maintaining a connection with the Spanish generals in the Low Countries. The importance of wresting the province from the Empire was indeed so obvious that, according to our historian, it occurred to Mazarin himself (i. 327); and the plans of the two Marshals were rather answers to his questions as to the best mode of effecting it than original suggestions of theirs. It may be thought that to adopt this view is to attribute too high a military capacity to the Cardinal; but, whether he first conceived the plan, or only adopted it at their advice, he is undoubtedly entitled to the credit of having exerted himself with great vigour for the prosecution of it, and of having spared no pains to furnish d'Enghien with reinforcements which more than counterbalanced his losses, and with supplies of every kind calculated to render his advance irresistible. A letter which he wrote on the subject to Turenne,[1] and of which M. Cheruel gives an abstract, enters into so minute an examination of the effect which the movements of the different inferior potentates, the King of Denmark, the Prince of Transylvania (the celebrated Ragotzky), the Landgrave of Hesse, the Queen Christina of Sweden, whose army was now commanded by General Koenigsmark, might be expected to have on the operations of the French army, as shows him to have united, in no low degree, the qualities of a War Minister with those of a diplomatist; while the last sentence of the letter furnishes an instance of the judgment, in which he surpassed Louvois himself, which led him, after pointing out the objects to be pursued in general terms, to leave the means of attaining them to the discretion of the generals themselves (i. 329).

[1] *Corr.* ii. 36.

Digitized by Google

They lost no time. In less than two months after the battle of Fribourg, Philipsburg, Worms, Mayence, with all the inferior fortresses of the district, fell one after another into the hands of the French; the principal credit of their capture belonging to Turenne, as d'Enghien had taken an opportunity of returning to Paris to gratify his vanity with the flattering congratulations of the citizens. By the end of October the whole district was subdued. According to the summarized report of their ambassador, Nani, to the Venetians, 'Both banks of the Rhine from the frontier of Switzerland to Mayence, with a territory two hundred leagues in extent, were now in the hands of the French as the result of a single campaign' (i. 344). And Mazarin, in the height of an elation which was not unnatural, caused a medal to be struck, with the inscription, 'Puer triumphator' in honour of the boy-king whose reign had been so brilliantly inaugurated, and who was represented on it as receiving, on his throne, the keys of thirty cities and fortresses.

But, though exulting in glory thus acquired by the prowess of the French arms, it was as a means rather than as an end that Mazarin chiefly prized it. Though not himself a Frenchman, he may fairly be believed when he affirms, as his correspondence continually does affirm, that he was honestly anxious for the honour of his sovereign and the prosperity of his adopted country. And he had too statesmanlike a mind not to know that the truest parent and nurse of national prosperity is peace. Accordingly, while unwearied in furnishing the generals with the means of victory, he was equally diligent in employing all the resources of diplomacy to strengthen the hands of the French plenipotentiaries at Münster. M. Cheruel appeals to his correspondence as a proof of the skill with which he laboured to conciliate the different princes of the Empire, and quotes his instructions to d'Avaux and Servien to regard as an object of special interest the gaining over the 'College of Imperial cities, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ratisbon, Bamberg, Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, Strasburg, and Colmar.'

Meantime the war went on as if no negotiations were on foot. D'Enghien's return to Paris in the autumn of 1644 has been mentioned; and, without imputing to him any far-sighted design foreign to his ardent and impulsive character, it might be fancied that he had cunningly contrived his movements with a view to raising his reputation at Turenne's expense. For he had taken back with him half his army, and had left the great Marshal with very inadequate forces to encounter Mercy. The consequence could hardly have surprised any

Digitized by Google

one. Mercy, in the spring of 1645, fell upon Turenne at Mariendal, and drove him back with heavy loss to the Maine. And his disaster gave d'Enghien an opportunity of acquiring fresh glory. Mazarin at once sent him back with ample reinforcements to the Rhine to recover the ground which had been lost; and by the beginning of July the inequality of the two armies was reversed, the number of the French as much exceeding that of the Imperialists as it had fallen short of it two months before. The Duke had now 23,000 men under his command, while twenty-seven years of war had so exhausted the resources of the Emperor and his allies that Mercy's force scarcely exceeded 15,000. But the great Bavarian's talents were able to counterbalance even that disparity, at all events while d'Enghien was his chief antagonist. He was pre-eminently skilful in the selection of his ground, and in divining the objects of his enemy. The Duke was eager to bring on a battle; but, though time after time he threatened to attack him, as often he found his position too strong for even his audacity to assail. At last his patience gave way. At the beginning of August his manœuvres had brought him within cannon-shot of the Imperial army; and he resolved to assault it, in spite of the remonstrances of Turenne, who warned him that the strength of its position, carefully entrenched as it was, more than counterbalanced his own numerical superiority. He disregarded the advice. He attacked the Bavarian entrenchments; and a very brief space of time sufficed to verify the admonitions of his abler colleague. The infantry were repulsed in the attempt to force the centre of the enemy with terrible slaughter. Jean de Werth, Mercy's second in command, utterly routed the cavalry, and took Maréchal Grammont prisoner. The entire French army was on the brink of destruction, when a chance shot struck down Mercy at the critical moment when he was about to render his victory decisive. In a moment the fortune of the day was changed. Jean de Werth, who succeeded to the command, though admirable when under orders, became nervous under the greater responsibility. Mercy had been preparing to pursue the assailant, and to charge the broken French regiments all along the line. Jean de Werth began to manœuvre, and so gave them time to recover from their confusion, and there have seldom been commanders better able to profit by a respite than the French. Turenne rallied the scattered infantry. D'Enghien, who never spared his personal exertions, restored order to some squadrons of cavalry, and used

Digitized by Google

them with such effect in the centre that eventually Jean de Werth retreated to Donawerth, leaving the field of battle to the Duke, thus unexpectedly transformed into the victor of the day. The Duke had certainly greatly damaged his reputation as a great general. But it is to be recorded to his credit that he frankly admitted that the preservation of the army was due rather to Turenne than to himself.[1] A letter which Mazarin wrote to the Marshal on the receipt of the intelligence of the victory reports d'Enghien's words, that 'Turenne had performed incredible exploits; and that, had it not been for his capacity and extraordinary courage, the battle would have been lost.'[2] And the same letter shows the Minister himself to have been one who knew how to turn such a victory to the best account. He instantly prepared to send reinforcements to Turenne (for d'Enghien, who had been wounded, had again returned to Paris) to replace the heavy losses sustained in the late battle. He sent to him a supply of money, too, though 'he begs him to believe, as Gospel-truth, that the Court at Paris was in a pitiable state for want of funds.'

But the real object of this display of power and resolution to continue the war was to strengthen the inclination of the Emperor and his allies to terminate it. Another letter of the Cardinal to the Duke de Longueville, the chief plenipotentiary at Münster, expresses his confidence that the result of the campaign, if prosecuted to the end as happily as it had been hitherto, would bring the conclusion of a peace which should confirm to France all the acquisitions of territory and fortresses which her armies had made.[3] And it is a remarkable proof of his foresight, as well as of the singular manner in which matrimonial connections for mere children were still formed, that, though Louis was not yet seven years old, he takes his marriage with an Infanta into his calculations, as smoothing the way for peace with Spain, which might save its honour if the permanent cession of the places which the French armies had conquered and had no

[1] The account of the battle in the *Essai sur la vie du grand Condé* is a tissue of mis-statements. But Lord Stanhope, in his *Life of Condé*, quotes the opinion of Napoleon, expressed in his *Précis des guerres du Maréchal Turenne*, that every part of Condé's character was faulty, except the tenacity with which he rallied his troops and renewed the battle. He shows that, had it not been for Mercy's death, Condé must have retreated across the Würtemberg Alps, an operation which could not fail to be attended with great loss, and, in short, that nothing but Jean de Werth's want of daring saved the French army from entire destruction.

[2] *Letters*, ii. 211.

[3] *Letters*, ii. 216 *seq.*

Digitized by Google

mind to restore, should have the character of being a part of the bride's dowry, and not a trophy of hostile conquest.

For the time, however, this suggestion of an arrangement with Spain which would have converted, and which indeed eventually did convert, the enmity of above one hundred years into a close alliance, produced no immediate result. On the contrary, for the next two years the war was carried on in the north of Spain with at least as much vigour as on the Rhine, Mazarin's earnestness in its prosecution receiving additional excitement from the circumstance that latterly the French armies in Catalonia had met with more than one reverse. The Marshal la Mothe Houdancourt had been defeated in an attempt to succour Lerida, which the Spaniards were besieging; he had failed even more conspicuously in an attack on Saragossa; while the discredit which his military disaster brought upon him was aggravated by complaints of his political incapacity, and of misappropriation of the monies placed at his disposal, which the Catalonians brought against him. He certainly was not greatly gifted with political shrewdness, since his mode of defending himself was to lay the blame of his failures on the Cardinal, and even on the Queen Regent (ii. 66). And it is not strange that their answer to his charges was to recall him in disgrace, and to imprison him in a fortress, to await the issue of a formal trial. Mazarin showed his judgment of character, when he replaced him by the Marshal d'Harcourt; and his opinion of the degree in which de la Mothe's supineness and incapacity had endangered French interests in Catalonia, by giving Harcourt strict injunctions to bring the enemy to battle. And the new commander followed out his orders with admirable energy and success. He defeated the Spanish army with great loss at Llorens; he took Rosas, which ensured the safety of his communications with France, and Balaguer, which commanded the Segre, and indirectly enabled him to protect Barcelona.

But troubles of another kind were beginning to show themselves. The most brilliant successes in war have commonly to be paid for by financial difficulties. And such difficulty no country in Europe was at this time less in a condition to encounter than France. Mazarin had placed a countryman of his own at the head of the finances, Particelli d'Emery, a man of unquestionable ability, though too proud of his ingenuity in devising expedients for the moment, to take sufficient heed to the degree in which he might be creating perplexities for the future (ii. 87). He created new offices, which he put up for sale; he increased old taxes;

Digitized by Google

invented new ones; let both old and new to farmers who obtained terms extravagantly favourable, on condition of advancing the sums required for the present emergencies. And so, to follow M. Cheruel in quoting the comment which Colbert subsequently made on his system, he devoured in one year the income of two; and, what was still more dangerous, he 'alienated the affections of the people, and gave them a motive for revolt and sedition on the first opportunity.'

Such an opportunity was not long in offering itself. An old edict of Henri II., issued after the battle of St. Quentin, when the Parisians were in daily fear of a siege, forbad the building of fresh houses in the suburbs of the city. But, when the danger passed away, the edict came to be forgotten; houses, and even streets, had been built on the forbidden ground; and d'Emery saw in this violation of a disused law a means of replenishing the exhausted treasury. The extent of the forbidden buildings was carefully measured, and a fine or tax, named *toisé*, was imposed for every fathom or *toise* of ground so occupied. The Parisians rose against it as one man. They saw in it the probable germ of a general house-tax; they appealed to the Parliament, entreating the counsellors to annul the edict; and that body, always glad of a pretext to usurp authority which did not belong to it, and at this moment, from its connection with the relics of the party of Importants, specially inclined to encroach on the prerogatives of the Council of State, gladly listened to the appeal, and issued an ordinance forbidding the King's officers to proceed with their measurements. The Council disallowed the ordinance of the Parliament, though at the same time it suspended the collection of the tax for a season. The Parliament addressed a remonstrance to the Queen. And when she reproved the remonstrants, a large party amongst the younger counsellors roused the populace of the city to go in a mass to the Palace of Justice, and implore the protection of the magistrates. The presidents, with the older and more sober-minded of the judges, in vain attempted to moderate the excitement. The masons and stonecutters formed themselves into gangs. A riot was evidently imminent. Threats of burning d'Emery's house were heard; and one young counsellor even boasted of their power to excite a general insurrection in every part of France; while at the same time, many of the provinces, exasperated by other taxes which affected themselves, showed symptoms of revolt. At Grenoble a most formidable riot broke out, in which Fouquet, the intendant of the Dauphiné, was attacked and wounded, and one

Digitized by Google

of the counsellors of the provincial Parliament was murdered; while in Languedoc matters were still worse. For four days the malcontents had absolute possession of Montpellier, plundering and burning the houses of the adherents of the Court, murdering their owners, and proceeding to such organized audacity, as to blockade Marshal Schomberg, the Lieutenant-General of the province, in the citadel. Mazarin himself was rather exasperated than intimidated by such violence; and the Council issued an edict to disfranchise the town, and raze its fortifications. But Schomberg, who, like most brave soldiers, had a wiser dread of civil war, took it upon himself to suspend the collection of the tax, and restored temporary tranquillity by this act of moderation.

But the agitation in Paris was not so readily pacified. The spirit which four years afterwards broke out in the Fronde was already raised, and did not lack many secret and some open instigators. D'Emery, alarmed at the discontent among the poorer classes, which the *toisé* had provoked, proposed to substitute for it a kind of property tax,[1] which would fall principally on the rich, and, consequently, would be still more productive. But the Parliament, though not venturing openly to oppose the change, sought to establish such numerous exemptions, as were calculated to render the collection of the new tax almost impracticable, and to diminish, by at least half, the revenue on which its inventor had calculated. We may judge of the factious and selfish character of this body by the exemptions of which M. Cheruel gives a list. This list is headed by 'the magistrates of the five sovereign courts, the Parliament, the Chamber of Accounts, the Chamber of Aids, the Grand Council, the advocates, attornies, notaries, and, in short, all the officers of justice.' Other exemptions followed, reducing the classes, on whom the tax was to be levied, to little more than those concerned in the collection or farming of the revenue, some of whom were known to have amassed large fortunes. But the farmers, as was not unnatural, raised an equal outcry at having to bear the whole burden; they affirmed, with apparent truth, that the wealth which was now imputed to them as a crime, was not confined to them, but that among the magistrates, who desired to exempt themselves, were to be found many whose riches were little inferior to their own; and they brought forward an argument of greater practical weight when they declared that the payment of the tax would disable them from in future making such advances as were often indispen-

[1] 'La taxe des aisés' (ii. 93).

Digitized by Google

sable to the Treasury for its daily expenses. They devised another, which they might well expect to have an even greater influence with the Court, from the events which were taking place in England. The news of the victory of the rebels on Marston Moor had just reached Paris, and they represented to the insurgents, with great plausibility, that the French Parliament was in reality following the example of the English one in aiming at the overthrow of the Royal authority; that already, as in England, a large party was speaking of Parliamentarians as opposed to Royalists, and that the example of England was a warning to the Queen-Regent to defend the King's authority against the encroachments of the Parliament (ii. 96).

The strife was vehement, but the farmers prevailed, and d'Emery returned to the *toisé*. The agitation against the unpopular impost was easily revived. It had skilful leaders. One day, a crowd of the wives of workmen threw themselves on their knees in the passage leading to the Chamber of the Parliament, to implore the aid of the counsellors. Another day, when the President of the Grand Chamber refused to convoke a meeting to protest against the tax, a party of the younger counsellors formed themselves into a separate body, elected a president of their own, and published their resolution to discuss and decide the question by themselves.

Such conduct was so unprecedented a violation of all old usages, and such an invasion of the privileges of the Chief Court of the Parliament itself, as made it easier for the government to deal with it. Even when the Queen, who was constitutionally irritable, lost her temper, and reproached Guyant, the President elected by the malcontents, as 'an old madman,' he met with no sympathy, and presently he and several of his partisans were banished, and the younger counsellors, who had put them forward, deprived of their leaders, did not dare to remonstrate when the Queen summoned them before her, and announced her firm resolution to adhere to the *toisé*.

Yet, while thus apparently triumphant, Mazarin was in reality far from being at ease. The princes who had contributed to make him Minister, d'Orléans and Condé, had been far from divining his character, or anticipating the extent of power and authority which the partiality of the Queen would enable him to exercise. They began to intrigue against him; they had no difficulty even in obtaining allies among his own colleagues or subordinates: to use a modern expression, they skilfully made capital out of the

Digitized by Google

reverses which the armies in Spain and on the Rhine had suffered in the winter of 1644–5, and were flattering themselves with the prospect of overthrowing him altogether, when in September 1645 the victory of Nordlingen dissipated all their hopes. Warlike glory was powerful enough to counterbalance political discontent and even pecuniary difficulties; and Mazarin, sagaciously availing himself of the popular elation, caused the King to hold a Bed of Justice, at which the financial edicts which he required were formally registered (ii. 104). And, having thus given proof of his power, he with equal sagacity yielded to the general feeling, repealing both the *toisé* and the property tax, and raising the money he required by the creation of new offices, and other expedients, some of which were not objectionable, but others, such as one which compelled many classes of traders and manufacturers to take out costly licenses, were stoutly resisted, and by their unpopularity facilitated the designs of those who were only biding their time, and watching for a favourable opportunity to excite fresh commotion.

For the moment, however, he looked on the general aspect of affairs as favourable to his government, and was even more pleased with the results of his foreign than with those of his domestic policy. He especially prided himself on having provided the King of Poland with a French wife, to whose influence he trusted to restore the old cordiality which had existed between the two countries till it was chilled, if not extinguished, by the follies and vices of Henri III. in his brief occupation of the Northern throne during the lifetime of Charles IX. And the Queen, sharing his satisfaction, gave him a signal proof of her confidence by creating for him the new office of superintendent of the education of the King, who, having now completed his seventh year, was according to the usages of the Royal family to pass from under the guardianship of ladies (ii. 114); and M. Cheruel, in relating this incident, takes occasion to protest against the charge which has been sometimes brought against the Cardinal of having neglected the education of his Royal pupil. He affirms that, thought he was too much occupied with politics to enquire minutely into the details of his studies, he at all times exercised a most judicious vigilance in keeping him from unworthy associates, and that in the latter years of his ministry, when he had no longer anything to fear from intriguing rivals, he contributed greatly by his advice to imbue his young master with those habits of order and of love of work which were among his most marked characteris-

Digitized by Google

tics. 'To judge from its results this education was by no means barren' (ii. 116).

M. Cheruel does not conceal his belief that the Queen's support of her Minister had a tenderer source than a mere approval of his policy; and that the report of her being secretly married to him was well founded.[1]

But, whatever may have been their source, the Queen's prepossessions in his favour were not shared by the rest of the Royal family. Condé, always covetous, was claiming additional promotion for his son: and d'Orléans, ever, as in his brother's time, restless and treacherous, was plotting to overthrow the Government from the mere love of intrigue. But Mazarin was more than a match for their enmity. He removed the Prince's chief confidant by a distant appointment; he won over the Duke's chief agent, the Abbé de la Rivière, even though the Pope had joined d'Orléans in employing his agency, so that the Abbé revealed to him all their machinations, which he easily baffled by surrounding the Duke and all his partisans with such a web of *espionnage* (we are proud of having no English word for the system) that their every movement was made known to him. Had the intrigues of these princes depended for success on their own abilities, Mazarin would have had little to fear. But their disposition was equally known to a man of singular shrewdness and audacity, Gondi, coadjutor of his uncle the Archbishop of Paris, better known by his later title of Cardinal de Retz; and, while he was thoroughly aware how destitute they both were of any kind of good quality, he yet saw the way to make them both, worthless and incapable as they were, serviceable to his own views. He himself was endowed with pre-eminent talents, which wanted nothing but the guidance of an honourable and well-regulated ambition. Unhappily, though no one had more ambition, no one had less principle to direct it to any creditable end. He had studied the life of Catiline; he had written a history of Fiesco's conspiracy against Doria; till conspiracies against an established government seemed to him the most praiseworthy of enterprises, and a successful conspirator the most enviable of heroes. Full of these notions he had borne a part in all the plots against Richelieu which in the latter years of the late reign d'Orléans had formed and betrayed; on one occasion even undertaking to be the principal agent,

[1] He quotes a letter from a later Duchess of Orléans, her stepdaughter, and mother of the Regent, in which the fact is positively stated.

Digitized by Google

and to stab the great Cardinal with his own hands while officiating at the christening of the Duke's daughter. There is not one of his contemporaries of whose designs and machinations we have a more thorough knowledge, since he was one of those who contributed to set the fashion of writing those autobiographical memoirs which form so attractive a portion of French literature. And, strange to say, the unscrupulous profligacy of most of the writers, together with the almost universal demoralization of the higher classes, are the very circumstances which enable us to place almost implicit confidence in their narratives. They hide nothing because they were ashamed of nothing. De Retz himself, though a Cardinal and an Archbishop, relates his gambling and duelling exploits, his intrigues of gallantry, his falsehood, his hypocritical profanation of the Sacraments, even his share in plotting murder, with a frankness which could only proceed from a conviction that nobles and courtiers were generally as bad as himself, and that neither man nor woman would think the worse of him for crimes which, considering his sacred calling, nothing but his own confession would render credible.

Ever since the accession of the present King he had been keeping in the background, but now he saw in the violence of the different factions in the Parliament, and in the envious discontent of the princes, the germ of future agitations which he confidently reckoned on guiding to his own advantage. And he began with great diligence

> Spargere voces
> In vulgum ambiguas, et quærere conscius arma,

though, perhaps, he did not yet foresee how soon he should have an opportunity to use them.

Meanwhile, the negotiations at Münster made but little progress; and Mazarin even began to give a new direction to the war, and sought to inflict a fresh chastisement on Spain by attacking her in Italy. In that country the Spanish Court had dealt him a heavy blow two years before, outwitting him in the election of a successor to Urban VIII., who died in 1644, and placing the tiara on the head of Innocent X., against whose nomination France had openly protested. Ever since, Italy, and especially Rome, had been a scene of chicanery and intrigue, in which, crafty as he was, Mazarin was not always the conqueror. His political designs were mixed up with the selfish object of procuring a cardinal's hat for his brother Michel, for which, in spite of his denial,

Digitized by Google

M. Cheruel admits that he made every kind of exertion, not only lavishing vast sums in securing allies at the Vatican, but trying to bribe Innocent himself by conferring one of the richest abbeys in France on one of his nephews, though he presently began to fear that the Pope, having secured the reward, had no intention of granting the promotion which it had been intended to buy. He resolved to resort to bolder measures, threatening the Pope's patrons, the Spaniards, as has been mentioned above, with attacks in a fresh quarter, and withdrawing his ambassador from Rome (ii. 162). The diplomatic slight Innocent retaliated by publishing a bull forbidding any cardinal to absent himself from the holy city without leave; an edict which touched Mazarin himself, but against which he was able to use the authority of the French Parliament, which formally protested against the bull as an encroachment on the rights of the Gallican Church (ii. 181). But the Pope had no weapon of sufficient power to measure against the warlike preparations of his adversary. An army and a fleet were speedily equipped, the former to expel the Spanish garrisons from a number of fortified towns in Tuscany, and afterwards, in conjunction with the fleet, to operate against Naples, where the long-continued tyranny of the Spanish viceroy, the Duke of Arcos, had made the whole population ripe for revolt. At Naples, indeed, Mazarin's ideas went beyond the mere expulsion of the Spaniard; he proposed to establish a king who, owing his throne to him, should also depend on him for its maintenance, and, therefore, should be a trustworthy ally against either Madrid or the Vatican. And he selected Prince Thomas of Savoy for the honour. The Prince embraced the scheme with eagerness, and on a visit to France in the spring of 1646, entered into a formal agreement with the Cardinal, which is, perhaps, as remarkable an anticipation of the events of a distant futurity as history ever supplied. Mazarin took into his calculations the possibility that the elder branch of the House of Savoy might become extinct, in which case Prince Thomas would inherit the sovereignty of Piedmont and Savoy. And, in that event, he stipulated that the Prince should content himself with adding Piedmont to the kingdom of Naples, and should make over Savoy and the country of Nice to France. Above two hundred years afterwards the cession was made, when, after the expulsion of the Austrians from Lombardy, Tuscany and the Emilia voluntarily sought annexation to the rapidly growing kingdom of Victor Emmanuel; but probably neither Louis Napoleon nor Cavour was aware that they were

Digitized by Google

but carrying out a scheme for the aggrandisement of France which had been conceived generations before by the Italian Minister of the third Bourbon.

On the present occasion, however, the Piedmontese Prince was doomed to disappointment. The French army easily made itself master of the majority of the Tuscan towns which it attacked, but Orbitello was strong, and its governor brave. It made a stout resistance, which was aided by allies stronger than the stoutest garrisons. A storm dispersed the French fleet, a fever attacked the troops on land, and when d'Arcos, who marched up in haste from the south, to succour it, arrived beneath its walls, he found the siege already raised; and all idea of the projected invasion of Naples abandoned. And it is a singular proof of the extent to which, at this time, faction and party feeling prevailed above every other in France, that, tenacious as the French have always been of their military renown, both courtiers and citizens were pleased at the repulse of the army at Orbitello; the common language being that it was a Cardinal's war, and not a French one (ii. 216).

The danger, however, which the Pope had run of exchanging Spanish for French neighbours at Naples, and the failure of the French scheme of conquest, disposed both Pope and Cardinal to greater moderation. The Pope conferred the coveted red hat on Michel Mazarin, and Mazarin offered more liberal conditions of peace than before, though still, in the opinion of M. Cheruel, such as Innocent could hardly have been expected to accept. Not that they were not more favourable than he had a right to expect, since d'Enghien, who was now commanding in the Netherlands, was at the head of a force sufficient to drive the Spaniards before him, and to make himself master of such important fortresses as Courtrai and Dunkerque. It is remarkable that, in relating these achievements, M. Cheruel attributes half the credit of them to the Duke of Orléans, who certainly was in command of one army, and to whom, on the faith of one of Mazarin's *carnets* he attributes 'a decision which' (he admits) 'was not usual with him' (ii. 230). But those of his contemporaries who have left accounts of the campaign are silent as to his merits, and the only actual fact which M. Cheruel himself mentions concerning him is that when d'Enghien and Gassion desired to attack the Spaniards and bring on a battle, d'Orléans preferred entrenching the camp and standing on the defensive. And, considering the character given of the Duke by his own daughter, that in cases of difficulty his

Digitized by Google

usual resource was to walk about whistling without giving any decision, and, when to difficulty danger was added, to go to bed, we may fairly doubt whether, in this instance, our historian has not placed too much trust on Mazarin's notes. Mazarin had, at this time, especial reason for wishing rather to disparage d'Enghien's reputation than to elevate it. Indeed, with all his patriotism—for the Cardinal had so completely adopted France as his country that his zeal for her welfare deserves no less honourable a name—he would, perhaps, have been as well pleased if d'Enghien's triumph had been less complete, for the Duke was by no means inclined to let the merit of good deeds be its own reward. On the contrary, every achievement was valued by him chiefly as a plea for some fresh demand on the Minister. And he found one at this time out of the disaster of the Mediterranean fleet. For the Admiral of France, de Brezé, who had commanded the expedition, had been killed, and d'Enghien, who had married his sister, now claimed the succession to the lucrative post of admiral as his right. Mazarin was determined not to grant so unreasonable a demand, and, perhaps, reckoned on support from that jealousy of the Condé family which d'Orléans often displayed; but, in this instance, to his dismay, he found the two princes acting in concord. D'Orléans vehemently supported d'Enghien's claim (ii. 231); and Mazarin could find no means of resisting their joint importunity but the strange one of advising the Queen to take the Admiralty herself, and in that way 'strengthen the royal authority.' She adopted his advice, and took upon herself both the office of Admiral and also that of Governor of Rochelle, which de Brezé had held in conjunction with it; and the act, unusual as it undoubtedly was, was fully justified by the ebullition of coarse insolence to which d'Enghien gave vent, telling her that, as she was unfit to hold either office, her investiture with them did not abate his claim to them.

Before the end of the year his idea of his own importance was greatly increased by the death of his father, and his consequent succession to the title of Condé. He began to talk as if he were absolute master of the kingdom; and Madame de Motteville tells us that the name of *petits-maîtres*, by which the French distinguish fops and coxcombs, was now first invented, and applied to a knot of worthless courtiers who attached themselves to his fortunes, and aped his airs and insolence, even in the King's apartments. But they presently learnt the unwelcome and unexpected lesson that even he was not invincible. As if the capture of Dun-

Digitized by Google

kerque had set the seal to his glory in the Netherlands, he now demanded the chief command in Spain, where the Count d'Harcourt, though generally governing in Catalonia with conspicuous ability, both military and civil, had recently sustained a severe repulse from the garrison of Lerida. No Minister could well have refused the application of Condé, as we must henceforth call him, for the command; and accordingly, early in 1647, the Prince repaired to Spain, taking with him the flower of his Flemish army as a reinforcement which he expected to find irresistible. Grammont's account[1] of the second siege of Lerida has probably made it better known than any single operation in the war. We will not spoil by abridgment his lively picture of his commander's insolent serenade, of the courteous dessert in which Don Gregorio Brice requited his music, and of the dashing 'alert' with which night after night the undaunted governor, whose name proves him to have been of British extraction, carried destruction into the French trenches. After heavy loss, Condé was for the first time compelled to retreat; and Mazarin must have been more than human if he had not yielded to some feeling of satisfaction at the opportunity thus afforded him of contrasting the discomfiture of the vain-glorious Prince with the successes which, after his departure from the Netherlands, Gassion and Rantzau continued to achieve, capturing Dixmude and La Bassée; while in Italy the Marshals de la Meilleraye and Plessis-Praslin effaced the memory of the failure before Orbitello by the reduction of Piombino and Porto Lugone; and in Germany Turenne crossed the Danube, separated the Austrian from the Bavarian army, driving one back on Vienna, the other on Munich, ravaged the whole Electorate of Bavaria up to the very walls of the capital, and compelled the Elector to sign a truce, by which he finally separated himself from the Emperor.

No more important step towards the conclusion of a general peace could possibly have been made; and peace was now more than ever Mazarin's object. Condé's failure before Lerida had furnished the wits of Paris, and all the adversaries of the government, who, if without wit, had abundant malice, with an inexhaustible subject for their jests and sarcasms. And songs and epigrams were freely circulated, which, while they ridiculed the unsuccessful general, did not spare the Minister. The Queen, indignant beyond measure, threw those writers who could be detected into prison; and among them a poet named Sarrasin, of some ce-

[1] *Mémoires de Grammont*, c. viii.

Digitized by Google

lebrity in his day, and known to be closely connected with the Coadjutor Gondi, whom Mazarin suspected, no doubt with justice, of being the instigator of no small portion of the satires circulated. It was evident that the war had ceased to be popular; and Mazarin was gradually reconciling himself to the idea of securing peace at any price. He did not yet abandon the hope, which he had cherished from the first, of acquiring the Netherlands for France; and M. Cheruel believes that the tenacity with which he clung to Catalonia was dictated in a great degree by the expectation of being able to make the withdrawal of the French armies from that province the price at which France might become mistress of Flanders (ii. 271). He was even prepared to consent to purchase the acquiescence of the Dutch Republic, by ceding to it the wealthy mart and almost impregnable fortress of Antwerp. But he presently found that, though the Stadtholder, the Prince of Orange, might be glad to close with such a bargain, the great majority of the Dutch deputies would not hear of it. And he had learnt to recognize the impossibility of making it an indispensable condition of peace. The peace party had also an ally who had naturally great influence with Anne, in the person of the Queen of England, who, as has been already mentioned, had been for nearly three years in Paris. She saw with agony the daily increasing danger of her husband, now wholly in the power of his enemies, and placed her sole hope of his extrication from his troubles on the exertion of the influence of France in his favour. But she could not conceal from herself that there could be no chance of her being able to direct the attention of the French Government to that object till the country should be relieved from the engrossing cares of the Continental war. She therefore strenuously pressed on her sister-in-law every argument that she could devise in favour of terminating the war; and there can, we think, be no doubt that Mazarin, on whom of course the decision depended, saw not only the wisdom but the absolute necessity of peace, though he believed it to be even more indispensable for Spain, and therefore thought himself in a position to demand favourable conditions. Indeed, in spite of the repulse at Orbitello, events at Naples were showing how very feeble was the hold of the Spaniards on any part of Italy.

But our space forbids us to do more than allude to the strange revolt headed by Masaniello, which broke out at Naples in July 1647, and which is related by M. Cheruel with picturesque liveliness (ii. 367 *seq.*). And we must confine

Digitized by Google

ourselves to those circumstances of France itself which forced upon the Minister the conviction of the advisability of hastening the conclusion of the negotiations in Westphalia.

As far as the Cardinal himself was concerned, M. Cheruel looks on him at this time, the autumn of 1647, as both powerful and generally popular. He had imitated his great predecessor in his patronage of literature, to which he gave judicious and practical encouragement by opening to the public his magnificent library. He gave liberal pensions to the most celebrated authors. And the scholars and poets of the capital repaid him by panegyrics which were not without their effect on their impulsive countrymen. One eulogized him as 'a great and divine prelate' for his introduction of the Opera. Another drew a compliment to his statesmanlike capacity out of his foreign extraction, not foreseeing how it was soon to be turned against him, but crediting him with the genius which Virgil had represented as the peculiar attribute of his countrymen:—

'Tu regere imperio populos, *Romane*, memento.'

But in France the liveliest popularity cannot stand against misfortune, which in any degree seems to blemish her military renown; nor in any country can it pacify a people weighed down, or fancying itself weighed down, by financial pressure. And both these causes were beginning to operate against the Cardinal; so that, says our author, it was from this moment, when he seemed to have attained his zenith, that his fortune began to wane. Anxieties were crowding upon him. Turenne was the only general whose skill was still triumphant. Gassion and Rantzau were defeated in Flanders, and soon afterwards Gassion himself was killed in besieging Lens. Prince Thomas of Savoy and the Marshal du Plessis-Praslin failed in more than one enterprise in the north of Italy; and at Naples, where, after the downfall of Masaniello, the Senate of the city, supported by the great bulk of the population, had offered themselves as willing subjects of the French crown, the rash folly of the Duke of Guise disconcerted all the projects and hopes which Mazarin had founded on the overtures they had addressed to him. It is certain that he had neither 'money, nor warlike supplies, nor troops' (ii. 446). In the opinion of the Cardinal, who knew him well, he was equally destitute of ability of any kind; but he was full of vanity and ambition; and, as on his mother's side he was descended from their ancient kings, he conceived the hope, justified by some astrological predictions, that the

Digitized by Google

Neapolitans would accept him for their sovereign. Though his enterprise was formally disavowed by Mazarin, he repaired to Naples in November. He soon found out that none of the nobles would join him. Even the lower classes, who were inclined to welcome him, were divided by faction. The utmost force which they could place at his disposal to encounter the Spaniards scarcely exceeded 4,000 men. It was hardly strange that when, with such a comparative handful of soldiers, he sought to expel the Spanish garrison from Naples, he was repulsed with heavy loss. And almost at the same time a new Don John of Austria drove the French fleet back to Toulon. The sole result of Guise's unauthorized and mischievous enterprise was entirely to establish the Spanish authority over the whole of Southern Italy.

This was bad enough. And diplomatic failures came to aggravate those of war. The Spaniards induced the Bavarians to break the Treaty of Ulm, which, as has been mentioned above, they had made with France; and prevailed on the Dutch deputies to conclude an alliance with themselves. The Duke of Longueville, the chief of the French deputies at Münster, began in consequence so to despair of a successful issue to the negotiations which he was conducting that he entreated to be recalled. Still, had these been all his difficulties, Mazarin would have been able to encounter them. He did not for a moment yield to despondency. He conciliated the Swedes, and secured their active co-operation. He strengthened Turenne, and sent him to hold the Bavarians in check (ii. 475). And, in full reliance on these and other resources, he bade his negotiators hold their ground at Münster, and abated very little of his demands. M. Cheruel quotes at length a letter written by him three years afterwards, as a complete justification of his foreign policy; corroborated as it is by the archives of the Dutch Republic preserved at the Hague (ii. 488).

But the financial difficulties, as they pressed him more nearly, were harder to deal with. D'Emery was more ingenious in devising new imposts than shrewd in judging of the feelings of the people who were to bear their weight. It seems never to have occurred to him that the unpopularity of a tax is not always measured by its amount. The revenues, not only of the current year, but of 1649, and a great portion of those of 1650, were already forestalled (ii. 491). It was hard to devise a wholly new tax. And his first expedient, therefore, was to introduce alterations of established duties which should render them more productive. The Parliament,

Digitized by Google

with which 'the general good could very rarely prevail over personal interests,' saw in the proposed modifications a pretext for reviving their own pretensions. It was to no purpose that the Chancellor proved to them that, if the modifications should increase the revenue, they would do so at the expense of the richer classes alone. They insisted on their right to examine the proposed measures, and, if they should choose, to reject them. And d'Emery was so far from being able to allow of such rejection that with safety to the State he could not even admit of any delay in the registration of the needful edicts. And, as the modifications on which he insisted would not, by themselves, be sufficiently productive, he proposed further to avail himself of the circumstance that the tax known as *la paulette*, which was granted for nine years at a time, was about to expire, to increase that to an amount which should supply the funds necessary for the maintenance of the army and fleet. The *paulette* derived its name from Sully's secretary, Charles Paulet, who had first devised it, and was a yearly duty levied on the judges and magistrates, which secured them the right of nominating their successor, and thus in fact made them, as M. Cheruel expresses it, 'freeholders of their offices.' To touch this tax was to touch the pockets of every member of every Chamber of the Parliament. The magistrates rose in unanimous opposition. They were supported by the tenants of the Royal domain, whose rents it was also proposed to increase. A formidable riot took place, in which cries of '*To arms, to arms!*' were heard; and cries of 'Naples' also, as if it were designed to threaten the audacious Minister with a French Masaniello (ii. 496). Even a Bed of Justice, to which Mazarin, in June 1648, conducted the young King, failed to silence his opponents. The Parliament could not indeed refuse to register the edicts which the Minister brought down; but at the same time the Advocate-General, Omer Talon, addressed the King in a speech which was in reality a warm remonstrance, telling him that, 'though it was true that his Majesty owed no account of his actions to any but God and his conscience, yet it concerned his glory that his subjects should be freemen and not slaves. It was in vain that Mazarin tried at one time to conciliate, at others to terrify, the Parliament into submission, issuing edicts with the one object, holding conferences with its chiefs with the other. As the spring passed away the excitement increased. The '*Fronde*' was beginning (ii. 517), and with this ominous warning M. Cheruel concludes his second volume.

Digitized by Google

ART. VIII.—THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND LITURGICAL COLOURS.

The Ancient Use of Liturgical Colours. By C. C. ROLFE. (Oxford and London, 1879.)

A STRANGE letter appeared in the *Times* in the early part of December, headed *Archidiaconal Functions: a New Irenicon.* It was to the effect that the archdeacons should inquire what colours were used in churches for coloured altar-cloths and other vestments; and it was proposed that the churchwardens should report especially whether the colours of the Roman sequence were used. And for this the following reason was given: that it was desirable that English Churchmen should be brought to discard all coloured vestments and altar-cloths which were Roman, and to revive, as Bishop Cosin did, the use of the five Biblical colours; so that, on the one hand, a concession would be made to the Evangelical party, who are specially opposed to Rome, and on the other to High Churchmen, who desire the vestments and colours; and it was hoped that some such compromise as this might prepare the way to a termination of our miserable law proceedings. The letter was signed Clapton Rolfe, and refers to the very curious book we are about to notice.

The use of colour in the adornment of churches and in Divine service is, naturally enough, one of the things hotly contested in the Church of England. It is also not very strange that there is no principle or principles that can be laid down according to which parties arrange themselves in this controversy. On the one hand, there is the growing and rapidly developing desire to use all that is best and most sumptuous in the worship of God; on the other, the equally natural fear of Popery, the doctrines of which are still connected in the vulgar mind with external show. It is not necessary to point out here that there is no reasonable Evangelical who wishes the service of God to be needlessly plain, or grudges to give of his own for what is right and needful, or to show that the most advanced Ritualist is offering as pure a spiritual service as the other.

What we mean by denying that there is any principle at stake implies only this: that there are differences of opinion as to what is proper, which depend on taste, and intelligence,

Digitized by Google

and learning, and not on religious principle. And if no religious principle is at stake, it is plain that through the natural progress of the present controversy reasonable and proper adornment must advance, and in the end prevail. In what exact direction it will advance, and what shape it will take, we may not see; but it is plainly undesirable and inexpedient to treat with contempt any development such as is now being made, and but reasonable to give the proper place to art, learning, and criticism.

The battle of stained glass was fought in the middle of the last century over the east window of S. Margaret's, Westminster; and that which had so much delighted Milton at Cambridge, the beauty of

> 'Storied windows, richly dight,
> Casting a dim religious light,'

has since had almost unlimited development. Now and then we hear of a bishop objecting to something in a window at the consecration of a church, or of an ecclesiastical judge going solemnly to view what an aggrieved parishioner has found fault with: but the decisions in these cases are not attended to in any others; they bind no one, and are of no importance. The same course will in due time be followed as to the walls of our churches. Mr. Burges has led the way with the chapel of Worcester College at Oxford. So also at Trinity College, Cambridge. The question of embellishing the interior of S. Paul's with mosaic is decided in principle, though the artistic committee which the Dean and Chapter have called to their aid are still at issue as to the mode of carrying out the scheme. The authorities of one cathedral may move more wisely and more vigorously than those of another, and so with parish churches. A perfectly voluntary movement must always be irregular, and either excessive or deficient. But it seems to us that no good reason can be given why there should not be generally, in a few years, the same picturesque and beautiful adornment of the walls of our churches as of the windows.

There is something specially enlivening about colour. What invalid, when he first goes out, does not feel it? Contrasts and variety seem to multiply themselves in nature, and chiefly through colouring. Whether it be that the seasons alter and the rich brown and yellow and purple of the autumn and winter succeed the summer brightness, or that we notice the variety of the lilies and the grasses of the field, who does not delight in it? Who does not look up to his Maker with

Digitized by Google

joy for it? And is it reasonable that in religion alone we should make for ourselves a perpetual fast from pleasant things, and that the house of God should be the only place plain and unadorned, when art, even in its lowest forms of mechanical colour painting, is adorning the rich man's house? When this is so, shall the poor man's house, the church, and the services in it, be left plain and unadorned? We think not. We have better notions of our fellow-countrymen, and believe that sense will triumph over ignorance and prejudice. Nor let any one talk nonsense about gaudy colouring. We need it; nature has it: only let it be used with taste and in proper harmony.

There seem to be two distinct sources of pleasure in colour; contrast and variety. With the former we have principally to do in religious art. The red camellia, or the orange or orange flower, among the dark green glossy leaves, gives a different sensation of pleasure from the variety of cinerarias of all hues of violet and purple from blue to red, all different, all pleasing the eye by comparison with one another. Variety such as this cannot be satisfactorily given artificially. It is nature's own work, and if it were given artificially, we should probably soon tire of it. So also as to breadth and variety: the difference between a field of bright red trifolium contrasting with green fields and a lawn spangled with daisies. The painter must choose the former rather than the latter, as he deals with effects and contrasts rather than with any microscopic imitation of nature.

This is the special character of the ancient coloured windows in Canterbury Cathedral. We must apply the same principle of contrast of bright powerful colour to all art, and to religious art more especially; for it would seem that there is reason to think that the words of the Bible and the practice of the Church indicate that a few special colours have a prescriptive right to a preference.

Well, then, with regard to the ornaments of the church and its ministers a good and worthy beginning has been made. Good women with pious and thoughtful care have adorned our altars. Something more is wished for now than a 'fair white linen cloth' and a 'carpet of silk or other decent stuff.' The former has ever symbolized our Lord's grave clothes, and ought to be plain and not adorned in any way; but the latter must needs have all reasonable and sumptuous adornment, and be better than the windows, better than the paintings and sculpture which surround it.

Here again colour brings diversity of opinion and arrange-

Digitized by Google

ment, and questions of what is best and most reasonable. How can we do better than follow the practices of the unreformed Church wherever these practices were not wrong? The principle runs throughout all law that what is not altered remains, and that alteration is not to be magnified but minimized. Naturally, therefore, our altars would be adorned on different days with the same colours as were used before the Reformation, and the same thing would follow as to the ornaments of the priest and his attendant ministers.

Whether the decision of the Privy Council will stand good that in all cathedrals and collegiate churches, whenever the Holy Eucharist is celebrated, the priest, deacon, and subdeacon shall wear copes; or whether, as is contended by many, the rubric means that on the like occasions in all churches the unreformed vestments shall be used; either view brings in the ancient colours, not as of obligation of law, no doubt, but as what will plainly be ultimately adopted by common consent as law. So it is with the quasi-legislation of Convocation on the concurrence of feasts, which there is no sort of doubt will be followed, not as being of any obligation whatever *proprio vigore*, but as of conclusive authority in so far as it records and interprets ancient rules which have never been abolished.

It has never been our view, and it never will be, to push forward change hastily; and if we say that nothing but an ecclesiastical revolution—of which there is no prospect at present—can prevent the ultimate use of colour in our churches and services, we are far from wishing to promote imprudent and unwise changes, which can only give pain and cause divisions. Beauty and adornment have no religious value in themselves, and must be always kept strictly and sternly subordinate to devotion. Changes ought to go on slowly and cautiously, and with a careful recollection and regard that our good be not evil spoken of. Wise men will follow change rather than lead it.

It has long been suspected that the rules concerning the liturgical colours given in the Sarum Missal did not represent the practice of the Church of England at the time when the Missal was printed, but had remained unchanged from very early times, probably from before the Conquest. These, as given at column 583 of the Burntisland reprint of the Missal, are that at Easter, Feasts of the Holy Virgin, Michaelmas, S. John the Evangelist, and Dedication of the Church, white vestments should be used; red on all other Sundays, Ash-Wednesday, Maundy-Thursday, Holy Cross days, and on all

Digitized by Google

days of apostles and martyrs, except at Easter-time. Yellow is appointed for days of confessors.

This, it will be seen, is incomplete, and some other directions are given in the book for different days as they occur. But the rules of the Church of Sarum were not, as to details of this kind, obligatory on churches of other dioceses, which for the most part seem to have followed the rites of Sarum in greater things, as a sort of national use, and the customs of their own dioceses as to others. No one has known of late what these latter rules and customs were; and, the rules of the Missal being incomplete and unsatisfactory, we see not much to blame in those who have judged for themselves, and taken a short cut by adopting what was likely to be approximately right, the present Roman usages. The time may be now come to show that this was a mistake, and it is well done in the book before us. We are recalled by it to the ancient usages of the Church of England. A preference for them follows naturally from the principle of the continuity of the Church of England, which it is above all things important for us to maintain at a time when Cardinal Newman has not been ashamed to talk of our Church as only 300 years old. He knows enough of us to know better than this, and we had thought better of him.

That a recurrence to Old English uses and the abandonment of Roman in a matter of this kind will serve at present to make peace at once between those who are fighting, as they think, a great battle of Protestantism and Catholicism, may perhaps provoke a smile, and can hardly have been seriously entertained by Mr. Rolfe. But the idea is not the less valuable for all that, and, when properly understood and when proper scope is given it, it embraces all that was really good and valuable of the unreformed state of things. And we may be thankful to any one who brings it forward.

Perhaps it is fair to say that our author takes rather the æsthetic than the liturgical view of colours. What we have been speaking of relates to colours appropriated to or dependent on the seasons of the ecclesiastical year; and we use them almost instinctively so. With him it is a much more general use of colour; and he does not profess to discover throughout ecclesiastical history, especially in the earlier times, anything like this special use of colours separately at different times of the last thousand years. He deals more with the use of colour in combination.

The book is intended to show that the Early Church followed the Jewish Church in adopting and using the five sacred colours mentioned in Exodus xxviii. 5, namely, gold, and

Digitized by Google

blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen. And there can be no doubt that, by reference to the Apocalypse and to S. Jerome and Bede and later writers, he makes out his case sufficiently. Nor is this surprising, because the Christian Church grew out of the Jewish Church as a development, and was the fulfilment of its types and prophecies. It may, perhaps, surprise men now, when we have spiritualized the types and explained away their literal meaning, to be told that the Early Church took so much of the old Dispensation in a manner which would now be called literal and carnal. We are used to attach mystical meanings to the dresses and ornaments of the Levitical priesthood; and we have not done wrong in this. But the Early Church took the matter up at an earlier stage, and adopted and adapted the thing itself, and afterwards spiritualized it. If, therefore, we say that Mr. Rolfe, in following the Early Church, took rather an æsthetical than a liturgical view of colours, it by no means implies that he or we should stop short there any more than the Early Church did, and should not go on to spiritualize also.

Mr. Rolfe's book is a handsome large octavo in a bright blue cover, *Indius* or *Blodius*, we do not know which, with a large margin after the fashion of Ruskin, for the proper use of margins, namely, to be written on. A good deal of pains has been taken with it, and great use made of Marriott and Dr. Rock. There does not seem to have been any independent investigation or searching out of authorities. So far as we have verified the authorities we find nothing to complain of. The author makes no pretence of classical learning, and tells us that his translations are made by friends at Oxford and Cambridge. On this we must remark that in places the translations are deplorable. What the Universities are come to now no one knows. We should have thought that nowhere could a man be found who would undertake this sort of work and then translate *parasceve* into Whitsun Day. And it is strange enough that the *quatuor tempora* are called in the same passage 'four seasons' and 'four days,' and Ash Wednesday made into the *four ferials in Holy Week*. This occurs at p. 166, in the long rubric concerning colours in the Ordinary of the Mass, of which we have just given the meaning. The author has taken pains to collate Pynson's edition of 1500 with others. It is a pity he did not use the Burntisland reprint of the Sarum Missal, from which he would have gathered that there are really no various readings here, and that therefore the rubric is probably one of the earliest parts of the book.

Digitized by Google

We fail to see anywhere in Mr. Rolfe's book a clear account of what the colours are, so that we may feel sure that the English names accurately represent the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin equivalents. He seems to have assumed this, but it would be well that some competent critic should look carefully at this part of the subject. Of white and gold there can be no question. The other colours are: ὑάκινθον (*hyacinthum*, translated 'blue'), πορφύραν (*purpuram*, 'purple'), and κόκκινον (*coccum bis tinctum*, 'scarlet'). The Latin is S. Jerome's translation. We have to do with the Christian Bible, which, until the revival of learning, was Greek and Latin, and so we need not here go back to the Hebrew words, however desirable and instructive it may be to do so.

The hyacinth takes us at once into the region of fable, and the curious confusion that seems to have come down through all time between blue and the colour of blood; which yet is not so strange after all. Blue blood comes of blue veins. Except when we have to do with blood actually shed, our thoughts go on what we see in our own bodies, and the *sangre azul* of the Spanish aristocracy connects itself with well-shaped hands.

The minstrels, then, who sang the praises of the lords of Ionia and formed the myths of Ajax and Hyacinthus, may well be supposed to have been more familiar with peace than war, and, in consequence, to have made the flower which sprang from the blood of one of their heroes blue, and not red. Though it no longer bears the marks which represented the name of either of them, we should without hesitation say that the hyacinth is the flower now called blue-bell in England (*Scilla nutans*); though three hundred years ago here, as shown by H. Lyte's Herbal of 1578, and in Scotland now, the blue-bell is a campanula. But unfortunately it is a flower of France and England, and rare in the lands bordering on the Mediterranean.

The botanical name seems to have been changed about the beginning of this century, and there has been a constant tradition to give the name of hyacinth to the flowers akin to the blue-bell. If the classical flower was a different one, this tradition must have come in early.

Ovid speaks of the hyacinth as a spring flower, and as purple: 'Tyrio nitentior ostro;' and Virgil as purple and 'suave rubens.' But we may dismiss these colours here, because purple and red are different colours from this, each needing its own explanation in the list we have now to deal with. Virgil also speaks of *vaccinia nigra*, which is but a translation of

Digitized by Google

the black hyacinth of Theocritus, and is plainly a dark shade of blue; just as he calls violets black. At first sight, the most puzzling epithet of the hyacinth is *ferrugineus*, for we connect the word with the rust of iron, and make it chestnut colour; but it is explained by Monro, in a note in his excellent edition of *Lucretius*, in book iv. line 76, to be the colour of steel heated in the fire and cooled, and he quotes a line of Plautus, which says that this is the colour of the sea—that colour which is peculiar at times to the Mediterranean—

'O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea.'

Virgil also speaks of the flower as *languens*, expressing exactly that droop of the blue-bell with which we are so familiar. The hyacinth colour, then, seems to be dark blue, and in these western regions may have been connected with the blue-bell, and become a brighter blue.

The next colour is purple, which is fully explained in the ninth book of Pliny's *Natural History*. In ix. 60 it is said to be: 'Nigrantis rosæ colore sublucens;' and again, at the end of ix. 62: 'Laus ei summa in colore sanguinis concreti, nigricans aspectu.' It seems to be the same as *ostrum*, and was extracted from shell-fish, principally a univalve spiral shell. The colour made at different places varied, the most northern being the darkest.

Coccum is explained in various places in Pliny to be made of grains, seeds, or eggs of insects—it is not clear which he means—collected from the ilex—ix. 65: 'Coccum Galatiæ rubens granum.' It is in truth the same as cochineal, only that the latter comes from an insect something like the *aphis*, or plant-louse, which infests the cactus, as that of the ancients did the ilex. In each case the supposed seeds or grains are the impregnated bodies of the female insect, killed and dried. The head and legs are small and difficult to see, and there are no wings. Vermilion seems to be named from the little worms produced from them when not properly killed. Scarlet, which is an English word as old as the twelfth century, is said to be Arabic, or may possibly come from *carnis*. From another Arabic word, *kermes*, crimson is derived. Ducange gives a reference to Rymer 10, p. 391: 'Unam peciam de sangwin tinctam in grano, duas pecias de blodio;' showing that they were different. Grain, again, is an old English word for red, and is merely a Latin translation from the Greek *coccum*. The Lincoln Lists of Ornaments, in the eighth volume of Dugdale, show plainly that *blodius* is blue, for both words occur together. There is no mention of *blodius* in the rules

Digitized by Google

for colour at Wells; but the copyist in the time of Charles I. puts *medius*, which is plainly a blunder for *indius* or *indicus*, indigo.

These colours then, gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and white, made up the ephod and the curious girdle of the ephod, probably with ornamental embroidery. Mr. Rolfe traces them through the great liturgical fourth chapter of the Apocalypse into the practice of the Early Church, and so on to our own times. The reference to the fourth and fifth chapters of the Apocalypse is not the strongest part of the book. The four and twenty elders have on their heads crowns of gold, and are in white raiment, and there are also the jasper and the sardine stone, and the rainbow, in sight like unto an emerald. The last is blue, the sardine stone red, and the jasper of various colours—purple, blue, green, and almost always veined with white. This, if it stood by itself, would not be worth much perhaps, but must be coupled with what went before of the Mosaic economy and the practice of the Church since. Whether our author makes out all the steps of his progress with perfect accuracy does not, perhaps, very much matter for the present purpose, because there is no sort of doubt that in the great mediæval revival and expansion of the Church the Judaic system was adopted and spiritualized, following in the direct steps of Bede, and of Jerome in his *Epistle to Fabiola*[1] (which seems to be the key to the subject and is most excellent), and of others of earlier times.

This treatise of S. Jerome is most remarkable, in which he enlarges on the Mosaic ornaments, and adopts them into the Christian system, the Latin words being to a great extent identical. If S. Jerome was not giving the currently received account of the origin and meaning of the ecclesiastical vestments of his time, how can we conceive it possible he should have acted so wildly? and if he was, how could it all have been invented unless at the beginning? It is not, of course, meant that a large, full-grown system of what now would be called Ritualism lasted all through the persecutions; but there must have been all along a theory capable of expansion, drawn, no doubt, from the traces we find in the Old Testament and the Apocalypse.

The colours, as has been said, were combined, not separate, nor used specially as appropriate to particular seasons. This later usage does not appear to be early or primitive: and if any one were unwise enough to attach distinct religious importance to colours for the seasons of the Christian year, the

[1] *Epist. Fabiolæ de Veste Sacerdotali.*

Digitized by Google

non-primitive origin of the custom would be a conclusive objection; but if taken as matter of merely positive but of decent and convenient observance, it is no objection.

Following apparently Marriott, Mr. Rolfe attributes what he calls the modern Roman sequence to Innocent III., who states that the Roman Church used white, red, black, and green. The words, taken from his book *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, i. 65, are these: 'Quattuor autem sunt principales colores, quibus secundum proprietates dierum sacras vestes ecclesia Romana distinguit—Albus, Rubeus, Niger, et Viridis.' Then follows this strange reason: 'Nam et in legalibus indumentis quattuor colores fuisse leguntur—Byssus et Purpura, Hyacinthus et Coccus.' Gold is left out in both. On all this our author is very severe; as well on the supposed change of number from five to four as on the alteration of the colours.

The four colours of Innocent III. along with violet make up that Roman sequence of colours which Mr. Rolfe forbids us to follow.

The English use is traced very elaborately, and on the whole satisfactorily, through a succession of illuminated MSS., which to a man of taste must have been a labour of love. And he makes out his case fairly enough on the whole. The prescribed colours are gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and white: yellow, *croceus*, standing for gold. Various subsidiary colours are stated to have been added in the corrupt times preceding the Reformation. Whether these are fairly to be considered as new colours, or merely as developments of the old, is a matter on which it is premature to express a very decided opinion.

Mr. Rolfe draws a very broad distinction between the colours proper for the Communion Service and for the Hours. This is important, if it be found to be supported by the different uses. So far as we have observed at present, a few special directions are given in the Sarum rubrics for special days; as to the rest, it would seem that the same colours were used in all the services.

This book may perhaps be held to convey a lesson to those who are concerned in Christian art, whether of window and mural decoration or embroidery, to combine as much as possible these five Mosaic colours principally and especially; not, of course, to the entire exclusion of different shades of these colours, or altogether of other colours, but so that if others are admitted the pre-eminence of these may be clear. Mr. Rolfe shows that in illuminations other colours are used pretty freely for non-liturgical copes, and it may well be

Digitized by Google

that the mere accessories, whether persons or things, may be adorned with the other colours.

This is, however, a matter which will deserve the careful attention of those who are concerned with the details of art.

In order to show what the use of Lincoln was, we here give the following extract from the Consuetudinary of Lincoln, called *Liber Niger*, belonging to the Dean and Chapter, copied in the seventeenth century. Just before the treatise from which the following passages are extracted are Chapter documents, the last of which is dated 1326, and the *Novum Registrum et Laudum* follows it, made in 1440, and lately printed by the Bishop of Lincoln. The ritual part may most probably have been copied in the interval, but this gives us no clue to the original composition of the document, which is one of a class which would be altered in many of its details, and copied from time to time by the Chancellor of the Cathedral, and therefore, as to its origin and contents, is of very uncertain date. Bishop Richard is mentioned, probably Richard of Gravesend, 1258–80. However early these directions may be, they cannot well be later than 1440. At page 123 are the following directions about colours:—

'Post hæc faciat sacrista vel suus clericus magnum altare cum ornamentis præparari tali altari decentibus pro festo solemni, deinde etiam capas præparet sericas pro chorum regentibus et videat quod capæ sint sicut postulant festa. Scilicet, si Martyr sit cujuscunque fuerit gradus sive Apostolus sive Evangelista sive Virgo, capæ sericæ rubeæ sint pro majori parte. Si confessor, viridi (*sic*) coloris sive fusci. Si matrona sive sponsa, crocei coloris.'

The expression 'pro majori parte' is explained further on, and it may be well to remark that the directions just given are in the part which gives regulations for Vespers or Matins, and not for the Communion Office, to which latter, however, the following relates:—

'Hoc facto eat in vestiarium ad induendum vestimentum et sacra pro celebratione missæ, et incepto *Gloria Patri* Officii Missæ[1] incedat Sacerdos ad Altare prædictum præcedentibus tribus diaconis, tribus subdiaconis, et duobus thuriferariis et bedellis quatuor episcopi. Unde sciendum est quod principalis diaconus et subdiaconus eunt in secta sacerdotis celebrantis et diaconus et subdiaconus medii ex alia secta et tertii diaconus et subdiaconus ex alia diversa secta secunda.'

So that, generally, three suits of different colours were used

[1] This agrees with Sarum use. The priest is to go to the altar when the Doxology at the end of the Introit and Psalm is begun.

Digitized by Google

at the same time at Mass, that of the Sacerdos (Bishop or Priest) being the colour proper for the day.

At Wells, on the other hand, two colours are given, or else it is said that all are to be white, or red, as the case may be, as if all the ornaments of the altar and ministers were on that day the same.

The regulations about colour at Wells seem to be later than those of Lincoln, and blue and green are directed for days of Confessors. It will be observed that the strict rules about the five colours which our author attributes to the unreformed Church of England do not seem to have been attended to either at Lincoln or Wells. Whether his theory breaks down altogether, or only partially, or some explanation is behind, such as that the Levitical colours were used for the Eucharist, and the rest for the choir services, must be left in doubt for the present. We need more knowledge and further investigation.

In this, as in a great many other things, it is important that perfectly free, though always reverent, criticism should be used. Those who make such restorations as we have been concerned with for the last forty years are in general enthusiastic men, not endued with the critical faculty, and ready always to accept authority or what is pleased to call itself authority as perfectly conclusive. We do not blame these men; we rather admire their enthusiasm. But the critical stage comes afterwards, when the headlong course is stopped and men look about them to see where they are; then the gains are counted up and the real true progress ascertained. We are hardly yet come to this; the progress of ecclesiastical development among us in greater things as well as in art is not complete as yet; the movement in advance has not spent itself. One of the consequences of this later and older criticism will doubtless be to dispel the comfortable self-satisfaction of the authorities of modern Rome that they are in all respects the exact representatives of the ancient state of things, and that they have the spirit as well as the external form. Something of this kind has begun already. Dr. Rock, after showing from Honorius of Autun, Innocent III., and the Ordo of Sienna, that the chasuble, covering everything, signified charity, complains grievously that the symbolism was destroyed by the fiddle-shaped chasubles of modern times (vol. i. p. 328):—

> The greater part of modern chasubles, especially those which come from France and Belgium, have lost much, if not the whole, of this beautiful and obvious symbolism. They are hard, stiff,

Digitized by Google

narrow, boardlike. The slitting up of this fine vestment at its sides followed when it had been shorn of its flowing folds; both were the slow work of time, and not the results of any canon or recommendations sent forth by the Church, or even a provincial, much less a general, council. No Papal decree ever afforded the slightest grounds for such an alteration; the nibbling scissors cut away the old vestments every now and then, and when new ones were to be supplied bad taste and parsimony whispered to each other and made them small.

How eminently high and dry this and the like are: and not even the external forms were properly preserved!

Mr. Rolfe is very fanciful. He dwells over and over again on the mystical meaning of numbers, especially of odd numbers, and of course in so far as this goes and as to what it implies the book is untrustworthy. It is written, however, in a lively manner and will be useful. But it must be remembered that a man is not really fit to write a book of this kind who cannot make out for himself the meaning of his Latin and Greek quotations and look out his references himself. Apart from the errors we have pointed out, and which are on the surface and can deceive no fairly educated clergyman, we have noticed none which detract from the value of the work; and it is due to Mr. Rolfe and the care he has taken about it that we should make this acknowledgment. It may be that he will be the leader of a new development; or possibly he is the pioneer of some one else, who will work on his lines more completely and more soberly. The book, so far as it goes, is good, and the great warning he gives that we should follow the mediæval Church of our fathers rather than Rome in matters great or small is advice we cannot too often or too strongly impress on our readers.

It is for us to adopt again into our system all the good things of old, to look at their meaning and the intention of their makers rather than at the abuse of them which afterwards came in, and to use them carefully and to go no further than the true meaning takes us in proper subservience to the great everlasting features of the truth.

Digitized by Google

ART. IX.—ANGLICAN ORDERS: CARDINAL NEWMAN AND MR. HUTTON.

The Anglican Ministry: its Nature and Value in relation to the Catholic Priesthood. An Essay by ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A., of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri, with a Preface by his Eminence Cardinal NEWMAN. (London, 1879.)

TWO years ago we laid before our readers a notice of the work of Canon Estcourt upon *Anglican Ordination.* That work, Mr. Hutton informs us (p. 26), 'has not produced among those, for whose benefit chiefly it was written, the effect that might fairly have been expected.' His own book is a new presentation of the same facts with which his predecessor dealt, and he does not pretend to novelty. Mr. Estcourt's 'line of argument has not been intentionally departed from in any particular,' and 'these pages may in fact be regarded as a kind of introduction' to his (p. 385). But the book of Canon Estcourt was, as we very willingly testify, extremely well written; a real work of theological science, which put the case as fairly as it could be put, and failed only because the case was bad. One asks, then, whether it is not superfluous to make, at so much cost of time both to writer and readers, a new statement of arguments so well urged before?

But in spite of all Mr. Hutton's professions of identity with his friend, we entirely recognize the *raison-d'être* of his labours. 'The fact that the solid book cannot obtain a serious hearing suggests that the lighter and less learned work may have a chance' (p. 27). Mr. Hutton writes for those whom lighter and less learned books are more likely to affect than those which are solid. 'The moral evidence against the reality of the Anglican priesthood,' as distinguished from the historical and theological; the *primâ facie* evidence, whose 'persuasiveness is greater than that of any bare arguments;' is what we are to expect here. And the reader has not gone far before he learns to translate the phrase 'moral' or '*primâ facie*' evidence into 'prejudice' or at best 'presumption.'

As if one, in conducting an argument on baptismal regeneration, were to dwell long and vehemently upon the failures of baptized people to realize their privileges, in the

Digitized by Google

hope that the reader would omit to perceive the poverty of the discussion upon the divine fact really in question, namely, whether the gift, used or misused, has been received from Christ. In fact, this introduction to Canon Estcourt resembles some German Introductions to the New Testament, intended rather to explain away than to recommend the work which they usher in. Mr. Estcourt is superseded. Of course, the new commander issues an order of the day complimentary to his predecessor. But we perceive what his secret instructions are: Our artillery is weak. You must retreat out of the open. Throw out plenty of skirmishers, whom you may call 'moral grounds,' or '*primâ facie* evidence.' Direct your attack only against those of the enemy who stand in exposed positions. And, above all, take care you keep your main body out of the fight if you can, for they don't stand fire.

We must make a preliminary remark upon the point of view from which even Canon Estcourt regards the question, but which reaches extravagant prominence in Mr. Hutton. Both think they are engaged in a suit which Anglicans institute before the Church of Rome for a recognition of their Orders; and this gives them the advantage of treating the matter in a lordly fashion by the laws of Rome, instead of going out to ask what are the laws of the Church Universal, as they would be bound to do if they were searching into facts for the information of their own consciences. When Mr. Hutton says (p. 161) that the practice of the Church is our only safe guide as to the essentials of a valid ordination, and explains in the next page what Church he means by saying that, 'while she is liberal in judging the traditional Oriental rites, she is strict in exacting conformity to those which she authorizes her own children to use,' it is quite manifest that he writes from a standpoint which must render his work useless to all persons not already Roman Catholics. But we wholly repudiate this method of regarding the question. Whether the Roman authorities recognize our Orders is a matter of no overwhelming consequence to us. But to them it is, or rather ought to be, of vital interest. For their decision involves to us no question of sin; while they commit, as Mr. Hutton allows, 'at least material sacrilege' (p. 124), when they reordain a convert if he was really a priest before; and we may add, they commit an equal sacrilege when they release from his vow of order one of our priests who desires (or, being married, is compelled) to live among them as a layman.

But beside the characteristics which are shared in some

Digitized by Google

degree by other Roman controversialists, Mr. Hutton's work possesses an entirely original peculiarity; it is intended for the reading only of a limited class. The chief argument of his book may be expressed in a single sentence: Anglican Orders are invalid because the power of sacrificing Christ is not mentioned in the Ordinal. And he declares himself to address those, and those only, who believe in this power. 'We have now,' he says (p. 38), 'narrowed the field in which the question before us lies. With fully nine-tenths of the Anglican clergy we have no controversy at all.' 'That Anglican Orders may be valid enough *as Anglican Orders* is not the question we have had before us' (p. 389). 'No assertion of an Apostolical succession which shrinks from admitting, both in theory and practice, all that is involved in the Catholic doctrine of the *sacerdotium* really demands the attention of Catholic theologians.' But Mr. Hutton cannot in reason afford to leave the position of the mere Anglican thus unassailed behind him. For if the latter should establish his Apostolical succession without believing in the *sacerdotium*, the alternative will be simply this: either he will have made good his claim to powers of which he is himself ignorant, in which case his victory goes to the account of the Ritualists as much as if they had gained it themselves; or else he will have given the Romanists a double defeat by first compelling them to recognize Anglican Orders, and secondly establishing the fact that the *sacerdotium* is no part of the Apostolic deposit. William of Orange was an effective competitor of James II., though he entertained lower notions of royal power. And does Mr. Hutton really suppose that Christ has two kinds of Orders to give, either of which may be taken at the pleasure of the receiver?

Our belief is that the *sacerdotium* does form part of the Apostolic deposit. But, granting this, even in any sense which Mr. Hutton may choose to attach to it, we still say that the restrictions which he lays down as to the persons whom he addresses condemn his book at once. One as little expects any scientific theologian, such as Morinus, or Courayer, or Mr. Haddan, or even Canon Estcourt, to lay down that he only addresses a restricted class, as to meet a similar warning in a mathematical treatise. True, every treatise must presuppose some principles. But, since these must be such as are recognized by all interested in the subject, there is never any necessity to warn any one off. But Mr. Hutton's assumption is not generally recognized, or recognized at all, even by the best writers in his own Church. That assumption

Digitized by Google

is not, be it well observed, the truth of the *sacerdotium*, but the relevancy of this truth to the question of valid ordination: a very different matter. A man might be well convinced of the principle of the royal supremacy, or the dispensing power of kings; but if he were an honest man, he would view with much suspicion any politician who introduced these matters into a question of valid coronation, and who declared himself able to prove his point only to such persons as were convinced of the reality of these powers in the king. Either, he would say, you are able to prove that the mention of these things is essential to valid coronation, or you are not. If you are, prove it, and then there will be no need to restrict the class of people to whom you address yourself; if not, you have no right to introduce them at all. What the true state of the case is in respect to mention of the *sacerdotium* in ordination we shall show pretty decisively by-and-by. For the present we observe that there is one class of persons whom Mr. Hutton's limitation of his audience ought to render extremely suspicious of him for their very souls' sake; those, namely, who believe in the *sacerdotium*. For the restriction connects itself with another error of method.

Though Cardinal Newman and Mr. Hutton uniformly treat the question of Anglican Orders in the light merely of an honourable claim which we advance on our own behalf, yet every conscientious mind will feel that this is neither the only, nor even the most important, view of them. Valid baptism also is an honourable claim; but for once that we need to think of baptism so, we need ten times to regard it as a covenant and obligation into which we have entered, and which God has sealed with His grace. The same is the case with Order. Mr. Hutton can perceive (p. 394) that the Reformers were 'some of them bishops and priests who had violated the most solemn obligations by which men can be bound;' but it never appears to strike him that he himself and his illustrious friend, when they renounced (or ignored, if he prefer the word) their Anglican Orders, violated a covenant far more solemn in its character than any of those promises of celibacy or obedience which the Reformers broke; for it was a sacramental covenant expressed in words the most awful, purporting to be made with God Himself, and sealed with His Holy Spirit. Repeatedly we find in this volume the argument of prudence and desire to be on the safe side used to turn a doubtful mind: a poor plea at best, to which those who yield may find that he that saveth his life shall lose it. But even in respect of safety, we may well re-

Digitized by Google

gard those who have repudiated a covenant so solemn as our Ordinal embodies rather in the light of men who have made an awful venture than in that of persons peculiarly secure. But not only have they made the venture themselves. They have the heart, they have the conscience, to entice other priests to follow their example, by every art of rhetoric, by concealing an act of repudiation under the guise of an act of self-abasement, by magnifying immaterial arguments and points of detail, by urging the force of doubts which they well know to be common to their own orders, or inherent in the very nature of God's dealings with us in religion, by encouraging men to cut short argument through an act of will, without telling them that it is the plainest duty to remain where, in the providence of God, we have been set, unless the reasons for change be convincing.

The whole proceeding comes then to this. A plausible lawyer whispers in the ear, first carefully seeing that he and his victim are alone: 'I perceive, dear sir, that you are becoming tired of your unattractive wife, and feel many longings for the brilliant lady whom I represent. Now I cannot indeed undertake to prove to the brutal literalism of lawyers and the public that the bald rites by which you were married constitute no legal union. But to you, my dear sir, who entertain lofty and proper conceptions of marriage, I think I can show that a ceremony in which these conceptions were not noticed was really no marriage at all.' What will the reply be if the man addressed is honestly desirous to do the truth? He will say, 'You are the last person with whom I shall take counsel. If it were merely with a claim of my own to the name of husband that I was dealing, you might persuade me not to urge it: but having to do with the claims upon me of the other party to the covenant, I must consider the matter on the broadest footing, lest proceeding not on grounds of law but on my own persuasions I should waken to find myself in the hands of divine justice.'

In truth, it is not merely by way of illustration, but literally, that Mr. Hutton's principles are applicable to marriage as well as Order. He informs us (p. 400, *note*) that Anglican Orders, in the case of persons having a vocation, 'had the nature of a vow:' but adds, 'such a vow of course as the Church can dispense from, and practically does so by her absolution of the convert.' Now suppose a convert were to say to him: I committed another sin quite of the same kind as that of taking Protestant Orders. I went into a Protestant church and was there married to a Protestant woman. But

Digitized by Google

as the absolution of the Church has dispensed me from the one vow, of course it has dispensed me from the other. I intend therefore to marry an attractive Catholic without attending to any heretical remonstrances. Mr. Hutton might then perceive, what he now conveniently forgets, that a confusion between absolution for the sin involved in making a promise and dispensation from the obligations incurred by the promise itself is nothing less than flagrant immorality.

The cogency of all this is much increased by the fact that all which this thorough partisan professes to be able to prove, even to his selected audience, is the doubtfulness of Anglican Orders; not their nullity. They 'cannot safely be accounted valid' (p. 4). 'It is not necessary that the nullity of Anglican Orders should be proved to demonstration' (p. 23). In truth Mr. Hutton's own admissions must prove to any Roman Catholic that the evidence for Anglican Orders is even on the extremest Roman grounds very weighty.

He grants that the expressed intention of the Ordinal to 'continue' the previously existing orders is 'a distinct witness to the general good intention with which the Anglican Ordinal was devised' (p. 145), while—

'A Catholic may readily grant that the Prayer-Book Ordinal, as it now stands, if not as it stood in Queen Elizabeth's days, employs matter and form in themselves so far sufficiently definite, that if it had come down from a remote antiquity in a community that had continuously preserved, though in an undeveloped form, the true Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament of Holy Order, and on the sacrifice of the Mass, there would probably have been no difficulty in obtaining from Rome a decision favourable to the validity of the Orders conferred by its use' (p. 165).

We must remember as a comment on the latter passage the words of Canon Estcourt (p. 199)—

'A sacrament conferred with the correct matter and form by a heretic, or even an atheist, is valid if he intends to do that rite which the Church does—and not specially the Roman Church, but the Church *in confuso;* even though he might not believe in the reality of the sacrament. And supposing the form to be clear and genuine, and the sense of the words is preserved in its integrity, even if the form were changed with an erroneous or heretical intent, the sacrament would still be valid. For no amount of heretical intention would invalidate it, provided that he intended in a general way to do what the Church does, and that he does not overthrow or destroy the legitimate sense of the words.'

What then is the authority by which the force of these presumptions in favour of our Orders is to be displaced in the

Digitized by Google

mind of a Roman Catholic? 'Practically the Church's judgment on Anglican Orders was pronounced in Mary's reign, six years before Parker's consecration. Cardinal Pole and the other bishops had before their eyes abundant evidence of the nature of Edwardine Orders, and there was no need formally to investigate their validity and to pronounce a sentence upon them' (p. 139). Upon this first decision Catholics of the present rest, for 'the Church does not need to be told that Anglican Orders in the nineteenth century, though highly spiced with a foreign Catholicism, are neither more nor less valid than the same Orders were in the sixteenth century, when impregnated with their native Protestantism they appeared in their true colours' (*ib.*). This is the authority. But then unfortunately, though 'taking the scholastic opinion' [of the necessity of the tradition of the instruments] 'for granted, it is easy to show that Cardinal Pole, and those who acted with him, could not have done otherwise than regard as null the Orders of an Edwardine priest, it may be admitted that it is less easy to show that the opinion on which they based that rejection was correct' (p. 142). Such being the shaky nature of the Roman tradition against our Orders, the actual Roman Church does not step in to support it. 'No formal and final decision has ever been pronounced by authority; and it may be added that it is quite unlikely that the future will hear of any such decision' (p. 138).

Manifestly then Mr. Hutton is comforting himself and his converts, and the bishops who ordain them, with words that have not even meaning, much less truth, when he says (p. 23) that 'the responsibility of ignoring' our Orders 'is assumed by the Church.' Where and when has his Church assumed any such responsibility? If the reference to Rome in the case of the Abyssinian Orders had not been made, and the Vicar Apostolic had re-ordained on his own responsibility, would either he or his candidates have had a right to call their act the act of 'the Church?' But a number of such acts, without any such decision as was given for the Abyssinians, constitute the whole Roman conduct regarding our Orders; fallible acts of fallible men, which leave it wholly doubtful to Roman converts on their own principles, whether they will not at the Day of Judgment turn out to be guilty of sacrilege.

Such then is the general scope of the reasoning by which, in the name of safety and prudence, these gentlemen would have us break the solemn covenant of our Ordination: an *ex-parte* statement, confessed to have no force except to men of a particular opinion, and even to them only reaching as far as

Digitized by Google

a doubt. Why, no honest man would void a contract with his butcher on such grounds. And if anybody allows himself to be persuaded, we can but remember 'If the blind lead the blind, shall they not both fall into the ditch?'

When we come from the general scope to the particular arguments, we find that to go through Mr. Hutton's chapters and answer him in the order and proportion in which he has deemed proper to write would be an interminable task. His work is not a theological treatise; it is but a big pamphlet, and degenerates in the Conclusion into something like a letter to an individual, full of appeals to personal feeling and the discontents natural in a temporary position. This is what Cardinal Newman calls elevating the controversy to a higher ground. Yes; the higher ground where the clouds hang. Or just as somebody, anxious to seize on our property, might refuse the narrow conditions of the law and prefer the higher ground of his perception that nothing should belong to us and everything to him. There is no higher ground than that of law.

But there are some questions which everybody who takes up the controversy ought to settle beforehand, such as these. Can we permit ourselves to regard the use which men make of God's gifts, or the realization which they have of the meaning of His gifts, as criteria of the question whether His gifts have been given? Is the Church endowed with any such powers as to be able to impose new conditions upon Christ's sacramental gifts, so that a form for claiming one of these, though taken from Himself and used with the intention of doing what He did, and confessedly sufficient in the primitive period of the Church, should be invalid because it does not embody a particular explanation of the meaning of His words? If we find ourselves constrained to answer the first of these questions in the affirmative, and the second in the negative, then a very large portion of Mr. Hutton's book is found to be mere byplay, with which a man truly intent upon conscientious study feels it an intellectual immorality to dally.

Thus we have a section (13) upon the want of backbone in our Bishops. Readers of *Pomponio Leto* and the stories of Lourdes and La Salette will judge whether the Roman Bishops, far more powerless to resist insolent aggressive factions and movements of popular superstition within their Church than ours to resist the secular powers, can safely make the possession of backbone a criterion of valid Orders. At all events the point is wholly subsidiary.

Digitized by Google

Here, again, we have another section (28), in which much is made of the Prayer-Book use of other terms beside priest, and the popular restriction of the term to the Roman clergy. Much might be said, were the point worthy of it, to show how exaggerated is the estimate of the historical disuse of the word among us.[1] But in fact Romanists can found no claim on this ground which the Baptists might not advance to the sole possession of baptism, or Unitarians to the sole belief in the Unity of God. What with faggots, armadas, and gunpowder plots, Rome made the good word Priest so hateful to the English people that it was often not in disrespect but in honour that they refused it to their clergy. But this again is a subsidiary point at the best. The sacerdotal terms which are not applied to the Christian ministry in the New Testament can scarce become indispensable notes of it.

But when we come to speak of the rival forms of Ordination, Anglican and Roman, and the history of their intention and compilation, there, indeed, we find points well worthy of treatment, were Mr. Hutton's treatment worthy of them. Let us mark it.

Our readers will permit us to recall to their memory certain information which we gave in our former article concerning the history of the Anglican Ordinal. We showed how Bucer proposed words as the sentence of Ordination in which he embodied the views of the foreign Reformers; how this form was rejected, and our present sentences (except for the changes of 1661) adopted instead; how the meaning and intention of these sentences was to apply to priests the words in which Christ enabled and commissioned the Apostles as his first priests; and to bishops the words in which S. Paul describes the grace given to Timothy as bishop; and so to make priests and bishops such as those of the New Testament. And, finally, we pointed out that it was from the Paraphrase of Erasmus, and not from any Protestant source, that these sentences were immediately derived.

We might have added that, though the Eastern Ordinals were not the direct sources of our form, yet they must, from the mere fact of being known to the Reformers, have exercised an important indirect influence over their minds. These

[1] Lovers of Wordsworth will appreciate Mr. Hutton's ponderous joking on the same use of the word Priest which we find in his poems. 'It is said that in the remote Lake District the Anglican clergyman has all along been styled "the priest," much as a simple child nursing her doll might say, "Poor Eddy, soon be better," when her little brother had died.'

Digitized by Google

proved at once how free they were to deal with the Roman form without endangering the validity of their Orders. Mr. Hutton is aware that the Eastern forms were known to them, indeed had been recognized as valid at the Council of Florence. But he does not perceive how decisive an answer this fact renders to his argument (p. 269), that the Reformers 'no doubt of set purpose rejected what the Schoolmen unanimously taught was absolutely necessary for the ordination of a Catholic priest, and in the scholastic philosophy they had themselves been trained, nor was there any other recognized by the Church which they could profess to take as their guide.' A refutation, short, sharp, and decisive, is rendered to this when we remember how unlikely the Reformers (who took from Greek forms the prayer of S. Chrysostom, certain petitions in the Litany, and the model of the Communion Office of 1549) were to overlook the fact which the Greek Ordinals showed them at a glance, that true priests could be made without using this scholastic requisite at all. This, however, by the way.

We think we may assert that the history which we gave (we believe for the first time) of the compilation of our forms, deserved a little notice from a writer who was devoting to the question of their validity a volume as large as Pearson on the Creed or the whole works of Bishop Butler. He does not hesitate to spend scores of pages upon mere newspaper gossip about the relations of Bishops and Ritualists. But what do we find, in his history of the composition of our Ordinal, upon the above definite facts? Not one word; but vague statements that the names of Cranmer and Bucer ought to render indisputable the Catholic assertion that the motive of the production of the Ordinal was heretical (p. 153); that 'foreign Protestants had fully as much to do with the composition of the Anglican Ordinal as had the English reforming bishops' (p. 146), and so forth. In order to perceive the whole insincerity of the latter assertion, we must remember that, according to Mr. Hutton himself (p. 272), 'the validity of the Anglican form appears to depend on the first clause only' of the sentence of Ordination. He had from us the plain proof that in this vital part of the service the proposal of the foreign Reformer was rejected; and yet ventures to say that that class of persons had fully as much to do as any other with the Ordinal.

We say that Mr. Hutton was well aware of the facts we related, for he vouchsafes us the following notice:—

Digitized by Google

'It is not a little singular that the *Church Quarterly*, which is commonly regarded as the organ of the advanced school, should be content merely to maintain and vindicate the professedly Scriptural character of the Anglican Ordinal. This peculiarity is there appealed to as evidence of the sufficiency of the Anglican form, though on Catholic principles it is rather a witness to the heretical doctrine of the Reformers on the nature of Holy Order. To invoke the language of Scripture privately interpreted against the teaching of the living Church has from the first been a characteristic of heresy.'

Does, then, Mr. Hutton think that the meaning of the texts as used in the Ordinal is heretical, or even a mere private interpretation? There is abundant Patristic authority for it. Does he mean that while the whole world of secular words lies open to a particular Church for the composition of her forms, she may not touch Scripture without previous permission from Rome? Does he mean that even if the Reformers were heretical, that would invalidate their Orders if the forms were valid? Or does he mean to assume that the forms are heretical, which is the very point in dispute? We really cannot fathom his meaning.

The taunt which he addresses to ourselves simply shows him to believe that a man ought to write what his party expect of him, not what he knows to be true. We are not the representatives of anybody who is willing, like Cardinal Newman and Mr. Hutton, absolutely to part company with the New Testament; nor yet of anybody who does not wish (as they do not wish) to know the best historical truth we can give him. We told the story to the best of our knowledge, as Dr. Stubbs or Mr. Freeman would tell an incident of the past, without minimizing in the slightest degree that element of foreign Protestantism in it which is to us detestable. And, accordingly, we began with a warning that 'we should advise no one to study the real history who has not nerve enough to recognize how close the Church of England lay in those days to mere Protestantism.' Upon which Mr. Hutton makes this comment:—'Nerve appears here to mean prejudices in favour of the High Church theory of Anglicanism sufficiently strong to enable him to set aside the conclusion that the Anglican Church is a merely human and Protestant institution; for to this he will inevitably be led by a study of its origin and real history' (p. 153). We must be allowed to doubt whether our words really 'appeared' to Mr. Hutton to have any such meaning. For when we observe that the 'real history' of the composition of our form, though coming from the very extremest period of the Reformation, yet was so ordered that a

Digitized by Google

Roman controversialist, eagerly gathering arguments from all quarters, is obliged to slur it over in vague allusions, and can find nothing in it to his purpose, we can imagine nothing less likely to persuade us that the Anglican Church is either Protestant or merely human.

The proper pendant to Mr. Hutton's treatment of our Ordinal is his treatment of the rival form in the Roman Pontifical. Upon this we ventured an observation which strikes Mr. Hutton as singularly bold: for Roman controversialists are apt, when their own forms are criticized, to cry out with Sir Andrew, 'Though I struck him first, yet it's no matter for that.' Our criticism turned on the fact, familiar to most, that the change from 'ordinandi' to 'ordinati' in the rubric of the Pontifical occurs at a point which cannot be really that at which the priest is made at all. Mr. Hutton replies:—'The truth is, that the Church does not regard her ordination as a momentary and almost magical act, like the passage of an electric spark, but in accordance with the principles stated by De Lugo as a whole, extending from the silent imposition of hands to the touching of the chalice and paten.'

Now it is quite manifest that this opinion of a continuous ordination, completed by the touching of the vessels, is entirely untenable. If, indeed, the word 'ordinati' occurred at the conclusion of the whole rite, the idea might be consistent with the service. But after its occurrence in the Pontifical there still comes the final laying on of hands, with the accompanying words: a rite which, if accidentally omitted, a Roman Bishop must afterwards supply. But even if the candidates had been called 'ordinandi' up to the end of the whole rite which Romanists deem necessary, there would still remain the historical absurdity of supposing that the first laying on of hands, with its prayer, though sufficient for the nine centuries during which it was the whole of the rite, has ceased to be so. In the words of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, 'Since all things which are contained in the ancient rituals still remain intact, and are even now performed in their integrity and sacredness, no one will readily believe that those very things which were once sufficient to complete the Sacrament of Order now no longer suffice.'[1] That is to say, the Ordination does *not* extend to the touching of the chalice and paten, but is over before it. We must regard this reply of Mr. Hutton's as one step in the succession of deceptions by which he attempts to conceal the overthrow which

[1] Estcourt, App. vi.

Digitized by Google

the true study of his own Ordinal brings upon his argument against ours.

The essential nature and history of the Roman form is given by Mr. Hutton as follows:—

'The Bishop, in his address to the ordinands, places first among the duties of the office they are to receive, the offering of sacrifice: *Sacerdotem etenim oportet offerre, benedicere, præesse, prædicare et baptizare.* A little later he speaks of their being called *mortis dominicæ mysterium celebrare.* Then he, and after him as many priests as are present, severally lay their hands on the candidates in silence. Next, while both the Bishop and the priests assisting extend their hands over those who receive the Order, he says a prayer, at the commencement of which occur the words, *Super hos famulos tuos benedictionem Sancti Spiritûs et gratiæ sacerdotalis* (the Sarum rite has *spiritualis*) *infunde virtutem.*'

This prayer is continued at some length, and throughout it the Bishop keeps his hands extended over the candidates.

'Now this "laying on of hands with prayer" is that portion of the rite which has come down from immemorial antiquity.'

In the West, some thousand or so years ago, other features were added:—

'. . . . Thus, after the imposition of hands, the new priest's hands are anointed, and he then touches the paten and chalice, in which are the elements prepared for consecration, while the Bishop says:—*Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo missasque celebrare tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini.* . . . From this point the newly-ordained concelebrates with the Bishop—that is, says aloud with him all the Canon of the Mass. . . . Towards the close of the ceremony he kneels once more before the Bishop, who lays both hands on his head, saying, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseris peccata remittuntur eis; et quorum retinueris, retenta sunt.*'

Now it would plainly be a fatal supposition for any Roman Catholic to make, that the powers named in these later additions were not conveyed by the earlier form, for in this case his Orders would have been cut off in the first nine centuries, during which these later efflorescences, as Mr. Hutton calls them, had no existence. These are not essential to ordination, but are required because of the obedience to her laws which Rome requires. And the accusation which she can bring against Churches which do not use these additions is not that of possessing no valid orders, but only that of disobeying her laws. This seems quite clear.

But turn to the passage in which Mr. Hutton (p. 247) gives his reasons why the last imposition of hands in the Roman

Digitized by Google

form, with its accompanying *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, would be of themselves insufficient:—

'St. Alphonsus [he says] quotes with approval Lacroix, who states (and adduces a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites under Benedict XIV. to the same effect), that if at an Ordination the second imposition of hands, which we have regarded as part of the first, should have accidentally been omitted, the whole ceremony, though it include the final imposition, with the form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, is null, and must be repeated *ab initio;* whereas, if this last have been omitted, it may be supplied later, and there is no need for any repetition; and the reason he gives seems to be unimpeachable, viz. that he who has not received the principal sacerdotal function, power over the true body of Christ, is unable to receive the minor function, power over Christ's mystical body, to absolve the penitent from sin; whereas, on the other hand, the minor office would necessarily, at least *in potentiâ*, "be included under the major."'

Now this reason of Liguori's is plainly absurd. For power over the real Body of Christ *as distinguished from power over His mystical Body* is not conferred by the first imposition of hands at all, unless you join with it that ceremony of the delivery of vessels, which, as we know, has really and historically no connexion with it. The fact is that both powers—all the powers of the priesthood—are conferred by that first imposition, and the delivery of the vessels and the final imposition stand to it in precisely the same relation; they are both superfluous rites added at later periods. And accordingly Scavini, who writes *ad mentem S. Alphonsi de Liguorio*,[1] adds to what Mr. Hutton quotes, that if an Ordination has taken place without the delivery of the instruments, or without the last imposition, then the omitted rite is alone to be repeated. Wherein he declares the practice, which is manifestly correct and reasonable, but contradicts (such is the confusion which prevails among Roman theologians on this point) the decision of the Sacred Congregation under Benedict XIV., which, in a case where the touch of the vessels had been omitted, directed the repetition of the whole ordination. We have little doubt that this decree under Benedict XIV. (quoted by Mr. Hutton as given by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, but by Scavini as by the Sacred Congregation of the Council) is the same which appears in Canon Estcourt's Appendix. If so, it does not refer to a case in which the first imposition of hands, but the *porrectio instrumentorum*, was omitted.

Thus Liguori's reasoning about the greater power in-

[1] Scavini, *Theol. Mor.* xi. 1. 288.

Digitized by Google

cluding the lesser, but not *vice versâ*, goes for nothing, together with all that Mr. Hutton builds upon it. But it is not merely that Mr. Hutton is guilty of borrowing a plainly unreal argument from Liguori. The Englishman upon this occasion is more slippery than the Italian; no small testimony to the effect which his change of faith has had upon him. He never tells us that, in the words which he quotes, Liguori is speaking only practically, that is, with reference to obedience to the commands of his Church. His speculative opinion—that is to say, his opinion as to doctrinal truth, with which in this controversy we are alone concerned—is quite different. Here are his words:—

'According to this third opinion' (namely, that both the powers of sacrificing and of absolving are given to the priest by the second (rather, first) imposition of hands), 'which on its intrinsic foundations appears to me (speculatively speaking) more probable, the aforesaid authors of the opinion dispute in assigning the Form of the presbyterate; for some, as Petroniensis (to whom De Lugo partly assents), say that it is the words which are uttered in delivering the chalice and paten; because, as he says, there remains a moral connexion between the imposition and the aforesaid form. But Morinus and Tournely, much more probably, say that the form is the prayer which is said by the bishop during the imposition of hands. I said that this opinion is the more probable, speaking speculatively; for since the second opinion is also probable, it is by all means to be followed in practice.'[1]

And exactly to the same effect is the decree of the Sacred Congregation above referred to. There the various opinions are recounted plainly to the advantage of the only tenable theory, that the prayer of the bishop and the imposition of hands which accompany it are the real and adequate matter and form. And it is only by a cynical application of the principle of probabilism that the Congregation directs the sacrilegious act of repeating an Ordination, which, according to their own judgment not obscurely indicated, is complete before:—

'But since some theologians of no mean repute have said that the imposition of hands which precedes the delivery of the instruments coalesces therewith so as to form one matter, by which, with the words pronounced by the bishop in delivering the instruments, the first part of sacerdotal power is conferred, namely, that of consecrating the Body of Christ; therefore the Sacred Congregation wisely considering that the previous imposition of hands already given so long before could have no moral conjunction with a delivery of in-

[1] S. Alphons. Lig. *Theol. Mor.* vi. 5. 749.

Digitized by Google

struments to be made on a later occasion, in order to allow some weight to this opinion in a matter of so much importance, wrote for answer that the whole ordination should be repeated conditionally.'[1]

When we detect Mr. Hutton suppressing these passages, by which it appears that the demand which he makes on us of a mention of sacrificial powers in Ordination represents but a less probable opinion among the extremest theologians of his own Church, we remember the words in which his illustrious friend describes him as writing for the Ritualists, because he believes in their honesty; and wonder wherein lies his peculiar title to write for persons possessed of that quality.

For when, omitting later additions, we confine our attention to the ancient and sufficient portion of the Roman rite, what mention of any power of sacrificing the Body and Blood of Christ do we find? That there can be no such mention we beforehand know, first, from the fact that it was thought necessary to add the *porrectio instrumentorum* at all,[2] and, secondly, from the fact that these Roman writers are so anxious to weld the later rite into a connexion with the earlier, which, as matter of history, it cannot really possess. And when we proceed to the rite itself, we find, as Mr. Hutton reminds us, the declaration that it is the duty of the priest 'to offer, to bless, to rule, to preach, and to baptize.' But the word *to offer* was applied in early Christian times exceedingly widely, and it is impossible to take it here, standing as it does without any dependent substantive, and on equal terms with so many other duties, even though it be mentioned first, as expressing with any clearness that awful function for which Mr. Hutton demands that all who believe in it must claim it distinctly, and set it wide apart from other duties. Then we have mention of the duty of celebrating the mystery of the Lord's death: an expression in no wise more sacrificial than many which the Anglican Church applies to her priests. But of course all this is merely introductory, and makes no part of the form of the sacrament. In the prayer which does possess that character, said as it is while the hands of the bishop are extended over the ordinands, there occurs not one syllable which can be taken as implying any mention of the awful power, the expression of which is demanded of us on

[1] Estcourt, Appendix, p. vii.

[2] We do not think it needful here to argue the question whether the words *accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium* conveyed in the minds of those who first added them the meaning which they have in the Council of Trent. But this is not a thing to be assumed; on the contrary, it cannot be shown to be true.

Digitized by Google

pain of surrendering our orders. There is a prayer for sacerdotal grace; an expression so little definite that the Sarum rite exchanged it for 'spiritual' grace. We have the offices of the Levites, of the seventy elders, of the Jewish priests—who, it is needless to say, offered only shadowy and typical sacrifices, the like of which nobody ever thought of denying to the clergy—named as the precedents for the presbyterate: and then the case of the 'Doctors,' whom God added as comrades to the Apostles, is adduced, that the bishop may pray that a similar aid to his weakness may be granted, that these servants of God may be endowed with the dignity of the presbyterate, be gifted with the Holy Spirit, obtain the office of second merit, show an edifying example, and be prudent co-operators with the order of bishops.

The reader will find in Morinus[1] a large number of ancient Western Ordinals, chiefly agreeing with the ancient Roman, and none of them possessing greater distinctness in mention of the sacrificing power. And preceding these, the same writer gives[2] many Greek forms, generally corresponding with that now found in the *Euchologion*, the highest sacerdotal words of which are the following, from the prayer which is said during the imposition of hands: 'Fill him with the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may be worthy to stand unblameably before Thy altar, to preach the Gospel of Thy kingdom, to minister the word of Thy truth, to offer to Thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices, to renew Thy people by the laver of regeneration.'

If distinctness in claiming the evangelical priesthood from its Author be the criterion of a sufficient form, we assert without fear of refutation, that the Anglican form is equal to any, and incomparably beyond the Roman, in this requisite.

We see, therefore, that when Cardinal Newman exclaims, 'Is so marvellous a gift included in the form of Ordination? Then where are the words which declare it? Surely it is too momentous, too awful a gift to be transmitted in silence;' he condemns his own Ordinal with far greater severity than ours. Of course if we were to accept his theory that the Roman rite 'is a concrete whole, one and indivisible, and acts *per modum unius*,' we should find none of this difficulty. But he must pardon us for saying that this theory is nothing but pretty words, and cannot be maintained for a moment in the face of real consideration. Reduced to plain English, it is the less probable doctrine above described, and involves

[1] *De Sac. Ord.* pp. 212 *sqq.* (ed. Paris, 1695). [2] *Ibid.* pp. 52 *sqq.*

Digitized by Google

that very absurdity, which the theologians of Benedict XIV. were not misty enough to hide from themselves, of supposing that the ancient Roman Ordinal has ceased to be the effective form, because later additions have been tacked to it. No amount of fine language can get over the fact which Mr. Hutton strives so unscrupulously to conceal, that priests are ordained in the Roman Church by a rite which embodies no more mention of the sacrifice than ours.

For it is plain to all men that every true claim which can be made for the Christian ministry must be covered by a form which comprehensively asks of the Lord His ministerial grace as He Himself gave it. Our form was not chosen with the intention to which Mr. Hutton (as usual coolly assuming the correctness of a peculiar Roman view) ascribes to it, of endowing the priest with the one power of absolution. The intention was that of regarding the Lord's words to His Apostles as describing the whole power for the remedy of human sin with which he intended to endow them: a far more reasonable interpretation of the Scripture. Mr. Hutton flounders miserably in the morasses of intention: 'Of course,' he allows (p. 181), 'it might be said that the heretical intention would in all cases be subordinated to the intention to do, if not what the Church does, at least what Christ instituted, and that this must be allowed to suffice.' And what does the reader suppose is his answer to this? 'But it is by no means clear that in the case, for instance, of the Elizabethan bishops their anti-Catholic convictions were not so much stronger than their hold on Christian dogma that if it had been demonstrated to them that the priesthood in the Catholic sense was in truth the institution of Christ, they would [not] have renounced Christianity rather than have given men the power of saying Mass. And if this be so,' and so on, and so on. What in the world can be answered to a writer who introduces these ludicrous imaginations into a serious theological argument, and requires us to renounce our Orders because he chooses to think that the Elizabethan bishops added to their intention of doing what Christ did an exception which they never thought of—'provided always that Christ did not intend to make priests like the Roman.'

It is true that Mr. Hutton adds: 'But this is only stated as suggestive, and not as the real grounds on which Anglican ordinations are rejected.' What these real grounds may be, we know not: what we do know is, that this 'suggestion,' of which he is plainly rather ashamed, is the only answer he attempts to a proposition which, if unanswered, is fatal to

Digitized by Google

his case; the proposition, namely, that the intention of the Anglican Ordinal is to do what Christ instituted.

We willingly concede the necessity, not only of an adequate form, but of an adequate intention in the use of that form, on the part of the Church. We even allow the need of intention in the ministrant. The act, if done palpably in sport, would not be valid; though we do not believe it to be in the ministrant's power to overbear, by a secret unexpressed intention, the power of that intention which serious performance of the rite implies. Our words on this subject meet Mr. Hutton's approval (p. 174). But he proceeds to say that did we really accept the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood we should find that our admissions had cut the ground from under our feet. The real fact is, that it is his requirements which do cut the ground from under his feet. In a case in which Christ has left the settlement of the form to the Church, the Apostolic and the most ancient universal rules of the Church upon the matter have, both as to the licence they allow and the restrictions they impose, a force similar to that which a form actually prescribed by Him, as in the case of baptism, possesses. And the proper intention is that of obeying Christ's command, claiming his promise, and seriously using an adequate form. It is no more in the power, even of the whole Church, not to say of one branch of the Church, to add to these necessary conditions or to subtract from them than in the case of baptism.[1] We have shown that, judging

[1] It is not too much to say that Mr. Hutton's book is answered by the following sentences from the decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, given by Canon Estcourt in his Appendix (p. vi.):—'Christ our Lord did not institute nor determine the matter and form of Ordination in every minute particular, but permitted the Church at her pleasure to determine and, for just causes, to change them, so long as she ever makes use of both things and words which are apt to signify the effect of Sacred Ordination. Then they [*i.e.* certain theologians] consider that the Church having in former times designated imposition of hands alone with the words which accompany it, yet afterwards, under a change of circumstances, left it to the Greeks and appointed a different matter to be used by the Latins. But this doctrine stumbles on two most grave difficulties. First, it is not sufficiently proved that Christ our Lord did give such power to the Church, and the opposite seems even to be shown for certain from the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi. cap. 2), where it declares that the Church has power left to her by Christ of changing things respecting the dispensation of sacraments *if their substance be preserved untouched;* but the change of matter and form belongs, not to the rite and dispensation, but to the substance. And then if the power described has been granted to the Church, it is altogether a gratuitous and arbitrary supposition that the Church has made use of it.' That the matter and form here declared unchangeable are not the literal words of the ancient Roman Ordinal, but that of prayer in general and

Digitized by Google

by the precedents of all the Catholic Church, the Anglican has not subtracted from the necessary form or intention, but amply provided both. Our ground is therefore perfectly secure. It is Mr. Hutton who is among the quicksands. His own principle that 'the practice of the Church is our only safe guide as to the essentials of valid consecration' is that which condemns him.

What, then, is the position of one of us who is led to entertain views of the ministry more sacerdotal than those which have been prevalent in the Anglican Church? Precisely similar to that of a man who grasps a higher conception of baptism than those who have given him his baptism possessed. If he be a true Catholic, he has imbibed the sacramental idea. And what is the sacramental idea but this, that the individual recipient is brought into connexion with the Lord Himself, and receives the grace from Him? Once you begin raising difficult questions about liturgiology and Church authority in respect to sacraments, you absolutely lose that individual certainty as well of Christ's calls as Christ's helps, which is the very purpose for which He instituted sacraments.

The absence of the sacramental conception of the Christian ministry is the well-known characteristic of the Protestant dissenting bodies which surround us. To them the ministry is a human institution as regards its immediate authors and the method of its ordination; and we do not attach much value to the claim which all such bodies make to a remote divine authorization of their ecclesiastical arrangements. Strange to say, it is precisely this ultra-Protestant notion of the priesthood which meets us in Mr. Hutton, for whom the immediate source of orders is human, since the living Church can enact that methods which the Divine Author of Orders once found sufficient to confer them are no longer so. With him, as with a Dissenter, the Divine Giver falls into a remoteness which practically hides Him from us behind the human Church.

It is a wonderful thing to hear Cardinal Newman proclaim the object of this book to be the elevation of common sense and history over archæology. There cannot be any history without some kind of archæology; but we suppose the distinction which the Cardinal means to draw is that which lies between the broad universal teachings of the past and minute or doubtful deductions from limited classes of facts. Why that is the very contrast which we assert to lie between sacra-

the laying on of hands, appears from the supposition of its being 'left to the Greeks,' who never used exactly the same words as the Latins.

Digitized by Google

mental requirements, founded upon Christ's declarations and the whole records of Catholicity, and those founded upon the practice of a limited period and a limited part of the Church; requirements which can never pretend to certainty, or maintain themselves without controversy. It is Mr. Hutton who is the archæologist; it is we who rest on history and common sense.

And here we might conclude. The theological argument is complete and decisive. Our Ordinal possesses all Catholic requisites for validity. And in spite of what Mr. Hutton says (p. 186) we maintain it to be preposterous (in the accurate sense of that word) to raise at this stage the question of character. We believe character to be impressed, as by Baptism, so also by Order; and have so used the term a page or two after the passage to which he refers. But to believe in character is a different thing from believing it the test of validity: a use of it which the Church has never made either as to Baptism or Ordination. To use it thus is as though a judge were to answer a plea for possession of our property by telling us 'it is not your property till I see what use you make of it.' But though the theological argument be concluded, yet we must remember that Mr. Hutton's book is confessedly intended to work by other means than theological argument. Its appeal is to the vague discontent which some men feel at their surroundings in the English Church. We shall therefore proceed to offer a few remarks upon the position of the *sacerdotium* and its adherents in the Church of England.

In the first place we shall be asked whether we ourselves believe in the *sacerdotium*. Most devoutly. But whether we believe in the idea of the *sacerdotium* which Mr. Hutton and Cardinal Newman maintain, we find it difficult to tell, on account of the absence of a definition from their book. We find indeed a deliberate refusal to define. 'What that priesthood is, will be only incidentally noticed in the pages of this essay, since the controversy before us does not concern its nature, but only the question of its being in possession of the Anglican Church. It is enough now to say that the Ritualist asserts that, equally with the Roman Catholic priest, he is divinely empowered to offer sacrifice and to absolve from sin' (p. 34). But that is so far from being an adequate definition, that it may be asserted categorically that Anglican theologians have never claimed less for the ministry of their Church than a power divinely given to sacrifice and absolve from sin as great as that of any Roman Catholic priest. Of course

Digitized by Google

they often meant by those phrases something very different from what Mr. Hutton means. But that question of meaning is precisely what he declines to discuss.

Further on we find (p. 39) the question stated thus. 'It is simply a question of facts. Have Anglicans that priesthood which Roman Catholics and the Oriental Churches, generally speaking, have? Do the Orders they receive confer on them sacramental grace, endowing them with supernatural powers, and enabling them to consecrate the Body of Christ, and to absolve penitent sinners in His name?' Mr. Hutton can found no argument on the supposition that our Orders have not claimed all this. If the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' do not imply the endowment with supernatural powers; the words, 'This is my Body,' ability to consecrate the Body of Christ; and the words, 'by His authority committed unto me I absolve thee,' ability to absolve penitents in His name: what meaning is left in words? And the reader will remember that, with Mr. Hutton, the question what our Church has got turns almost altogether on the question what our Church has claimed. But it is an instance of his slipshod reasoning, that while here he lays down the question (so far as the Holy Eucharist is concerned) to be, Have Anglicans power enabling them to *consecrate* the Body of Christ, he never addresses himself to that point at all, but to the question, Do they claim to *sacrifice* the Body of Christ? But Cardinal Newman says that a High Churchman is 'one who holds . . . perhaps the Real Presence, not the *sacerdotium*.' He does not contend that this belief in the Real Presence is unwarranted in an Anglican, in view of the formularies and the history of his Church. Now belief in the Real Presence implies certainly belief in the power to consecrate the Body of Christ. He allows, then, that *our* Church claims this power. But when he separates this faith from that in the *sacerdotium*, he forgets that which Mr. Hutton for a moment remembered when he wrote the sentence above quoted, namely, that belief in the Real Presence implies belief in the sacrifice. If the sacrifice be reality and not words, then wherever the Body of Christ is, there it must be pleaded.

Shortly afterwards, indeed, we find some reason to think that the idea of the *sacerdotium* presumed is one which implies Transubstantiation. For, speaking of the doctrines which the leaders of the Tract movement thought consistent with Anglicanism, the Cardinal says, 'From the first they believed the Eucharist to be a sacrifice; but the mode of the Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice they did not determine. Certainly I

Digitized by Google

myself did not hold Transubstantiation.' If this were the doctrine assumed, we should merely warn readers of the fact, and beg them to be very sure that they felt themselves able to determine the mode of the Presence and Sacrifice, and determine it in favour of Transubstantiation, before they classed themselves among those to whom the book is addressed. We confess that we could not include ourselves among the number.

But this *obiter dictum* does not at all hold the position of a preliminary definition, and we feel pretty certain that, were we to consider the book as only intended to influence those who believe in Transubstantiation, we should be doing injustice to the purpose of the authors. 'Catholics,' says Cardinal Newman, 'and the Ritualists hold that in the Holy Eucharist the Gospel priest offers Christ in His Body and Blood for the living and the dead, and that by virtue of such offering he is a priest.' That description may include many who do not define Transubstantiation; it includes ourselves. And if we take the subject before us to be the position in the Anglican Church of those who hold doctrine upon the priesthood and sacrifice not more closely defined than by this latter extract from his Eminence, the reader must not complain of us for vagueness. We but follow the consistent and deliberate vagueness of the book with which we are dealing.

Now when we ask what support this doctrine meets in the Anglican tradition, we must, lest we expect too much, remember in the first place the nature of the support which it meets from the general tradition of the Church at large, and from Holy Scripture. Mr. Hutton strenuously contends that Holy Scripture, without the guidance of the Church, would not convey it to the mind; equally vain is it to deny that many passages of the Fathers may be adduced against it. What we do find, both in Holy Scripture and in the Fathers, is a multitude of expressions, and a general tendency of teaching, which, with this doctrine in our minds, we can perceive upon the whole imperatively to imply and require it: passages which lead up to it, foretell it, and show that it is being evolved. This view by no means goes the length of the doctrine of development as taught by the school of Cardinal Newman. It is but what every man of every school must allow, when, in obedience to the needs of the present, he draws from Scripture and the Fathers statements and definitions not literally or verbally contained there. A doctrine of development which regards with calmness the absence in the past of the exact proportions of our present views, and even

Digitized by Google

the presence in the past of much that seems adverse to them, is a necessity with any honest thinker and believer in God's constant teaching of His Church. But those can least of all deny such a doctrine who believe in developments far more extensive than this.

Now the question is whether that which can be said of the place of the *sacerdotium* in Scripture and in the Fathers may not be said also of its place in the records of Anglican theology? May not the believer in this doctrine find in those records a continuous succession of utterances, which to him will require it to explain them and draw out their force, and which show that the writers were striving after this truth, although limited by the intellectual conditions of their time? This does not appear to be Cardinal Newman's present view of the Anglican tradition.

But that eminent person must excuse us if we say that his treatment of the Church of his baptism offends us in precisely the same way with M. Renan's treatment of the Gospel history, or Mr. Matthew Arnold's of the Hebrew religion. In each case we have exquisite style, of course; beautiful sentiment; an appearance of genial, though condescending sympathy: but a cold determination to recognize nothing but what is merely human. All these writers seem to say to us, 'You think that God is speaking to you. Vain thought: He is not there. It is not even true that you are speaking to Him. What you suppose to be religious emotions are but earthly feelings. All is human, nothing divine.'

Thus he grants that in the case of many men, the day of Ordination 'is the one great day of their lives, which cannot come twice—the day on which, in their fresh youth, they freely dedicated themselves and all their powers to the service of their Redeemer—solemn and joyful at the time, and ever after fragrant in their memories.' Beautiful words indeed. But is this human feeling all? Did the remembrance of his Ordination bring to Cardinal Newman, when he was among us, only the thought of a free dedication of himself, and no thought of a divine gift through the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost?' If indeed his idea of his priesthood was merely that it was an enthusiastic self-surrender of his youth, no wonder that he so easily renounced it; for that which is the very kernel of most men's faith concerning the day of Ordination was absent in him.

Of a like grudging and purely earthly character is the view of Anglican sacerdotalism which he prefixes to the work of Mr. Hutton. He selects for us a passage from Waterland,

Digitized by Google

as giving us the highest measure of Anglican doctrine upon the subject. And the tenor of it is this; that there are eight senses in which that writer allows the Holy Eucharist to be a true and proper sacrifice. '1. The sacrifice of alms to the poor and oblations to the Church. 2. The sacrifice of prayer. 3. The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. 4. The sacrifice of a penitent and contrite heart. 5. The sacrifice of ourselves. 6. The offering of the mystical body of Christ, that is, His Church. 7. The offering up of true converts and sincere penitents to God by their pastors. 8. The sacrifice of faith and hope and self-humiliation in commemorating the Grand Sacrifice.' And the definition of the nature of the priesthood follows that of the sacrifice. Having quoted this passage of Waterland, Cardinal Newman challenges us to produce any one who teaches higher doctrine. 'Who,' he asks, 'in the question of the *sacerdotium* rises higher than Mede, Bull, Johnson, and Hickes, as explaining the Eucharist to be a material sacrifice of bread and wine, or than Waterland, and many more, as considering it a spiritual sacrifice of the heart, or than Waterland again, Cudworth, Sharp, and others, in accepting it as a symbolical present feast upon the past proper and real sacrifice on Cavalry?' The question is, whether he has fairly let us know the highest countenance which Anglican theology gives to a developed doctrine of the *sacerdotium*. Many motives of generosity and honour bound him to quote the very strongest passages he could find; for a friend who has been abandoned is the very last whom a man of noble mind should wish to misrepresent.

Now, first, let us remember, as a circumstance of which Cardinal Newman takes no notice, that the doctrine of the Fathers is deliberately adopted by all the Anglican theologians without exception. They regard it with one consent as authoritative, as something from which they will not allow themselves to differ. They thus place the Fathers on a far higher level than that which they claim for their own expositions: and a man is perfectly justified in falling back upon the Patristic doctrine rightly explained, even where the Anglican expounder gives a lower and less adequate version of it. And what is this but to say that the whole body of tradition out of which the Roman doctrine itself developed, and with which it professes itself to agree, is the foundation of the Anglican tradition too?

Archbishop Parker, the best representative of that Elizabethan age, whose history Mr. Hutton taunts us as afraid to treat, published in 1567, as a *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, expressing

Digitized by Google

the Eucharistic doctrine of the Anglican Church, a little volume containing a homily of Ælfric, delivered a thousand years before. We have not room for extracts, but the state of the case may be judged from the pithy observation of Strype: 'This Saxon homily is printed in Fox's second volume. But he hath left out some particular passages which look favourably toward the doctrine of the Church of Rome, which are not omitted in the Archbishop's edition of the book.' [1]

No. 81 of the *Tracts for the Times*—a series of which none of the contents can be unknown to Cardinal Newman—consists of a *catena* of extracts from writers in the later English Church upon the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Now, upon opening this compilation, which makes a volume of more than 400 closely printed pages, one is struck by the fact that among the sixty-three writers whose works are there laid under contribution, Waterland is not contained at all. Does that circumstance look as if his Eminence had been really trying to find the highest level of doctrine which had been held lawful in the English Church, and not rather something which, while appearing frankly to allow the utmost truth in our teaching, should yet be carefully selected for its inadequacy?

The reader will be good enough to take with him for comparison with the following extracts the distinct remembrance of that which Cardinal Newman declares to be the highest point which Anglican theology reaches. 1. A sacrifice of faith, hope, and self-humiliation in commemorating the Grand Sacrifice [the sacrifice, observe, consisting in those subjective feelings on our part, not in the objective memorial]. 2. A material sacrifice of bread and wine. 3. A symbolical present feast upon the past proper and real sacrifice on Calvary. The references are to the pages of Tract 81:—

BILSON.—'You believe not me. Well, what if your own fellows and friends teach the same? . . . Peter Lombard, in his fourth book and twelfth distinction says, "I demand whether that which the priest doth be properly called a sacrifice or an oblation, and whether Christ be daily offered, or else were offered only once." To this our answer is brief: that which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory and representation of the true sacrifice and holy oblation made on the altar of the cross. Now what this meaneth, Christ is offered in a Sacrament, we need no fairer interpretation than that which your own gloss often repeateth, "Christ is offered in a Sacrament," that is, His offering is represented and a memory of His passion celebrated. "It is the

[1] Strype's *Parker*, ii. 503.

Digitized by Google

same oblation which He made," that is, it is a representation of the same passion. "Christ is offered every day mystically," that is, the oblation which Christ made for us is represented in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. With this concurreth Thomas of Aquine. "Because the celebration of this Sacrament is a certain image of Christ's passion, it may conveniently be called the sacrificing of Christ." . . . Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a sacrifice' (p. 68).

OVERALL.—'If we compare the Eucharist with the sacrifice once made upon the Cross, with reference to the killing or destroying of the sacrifice, or with reference to the visibility of it, in that sense we call it only a commemorative sacrifice, as the Fathers do. But if we compare the Eucharist with Christ's sacrifice made once upon the Cross as concerning the effect of it, we say that *that* was a *sufficient* sacrifice; but withal that *it* is a true, real, and *efficient* sacrifice, and both of them propitiatory for the sins of the whole world' (p. 71).

Id.—'The people may offer it up all the improper ways, none but the priest can offer it as a proper sacrifice' (p. 73).

FIELD.—'We offer to Thy view and here set before Thine eyes the crucified Body of Christ Thy Son, which is here present in mystery and sacrament, and the blood which He once shed for our sakes, which we know to be that pure, holy, undefiled, and eternal Sacrifice wherewith only Thou art pleased' (p. 79).

Id.—'There is nothing found in the Canon of the Mass rightly understood that maketh anything for the new real offering of Christ to God His Father as a propitiatory sacrifice to take away sins. . . . The best and worthiest of the guides of God's Church before Luther's time taught, as we do, that the sacrifice of the altar is only the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and a mere representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice once offered on the Cross' (p. 80, 81).

ANDREWES.—'They of our side . . . believe that the Eucharist was instituted by our Lord for the commemoration of Him; even of His sacrifice; or, if we may so speak, for a commemorative sacrifice; and not only for a sacrament or spiritual food' (p. 94).

Id.—'Take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation, and there will not be long any controversy with us concerning the sacrifice' (p. 95).

Id.—'1. The Eucharist ever was and by us is considered, both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice. 2. A sacrifice is proper and applicable only to divine worship. 3. The sacrifice of Christ's death did succeed to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. 4. The sacrifice of Christ's death is available for present, absent, living, dead, yea for them that are yet unborn. 5. When we say the dead, we mean it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and all (because we are all members of one body). These no man will deny. In a word, we hold with S. Augustine in the very same chapter which the Cardinal citeth, Quod hujus Sacrificii caro et sanguis, ante adventum Christi, per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi, per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum Christi, per sacramentum memoriæ celebratur' (p. 99).

Digitized by Google

LAUD.—'At and in the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices. One by the priest only; that's the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death represented in bread broken and wine poured out' (p. 103).

MEDE.—'The receiving of which sacrament or participating of which sacrifice exhibited to us, we say is profitable only to them that receive it, and participate of it; but the prayers that we add thereunto in presenting the death and merits of our Saviour to God are not only beneficial to them that are present, but to them that are absent also, to the dead and the living both, to all true members of the Catholic Church of Christ' (p. 136).

THORNDIKE.—'I say then that, having proved the consecration of the Eucharist to be the production of the Body and Blood of Christ crucified, or the causing them to be mystically present in the elements thereof, as in a sacrament, representing them separated by the crucifying of Christ; and the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross being necessarily propitiatory and impetratory both; it cannot be denied that the sacrament of the Eucharist, inasmuch as it is the same sacrifice of Christ upon the cross (as that which representeth is truly said to be the thing which it representeth), is also both propitiatory and impetratory by virtue of the consecration of it, whereby it becometh the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross' (p. 172).

BULL.—'The ancient Fathers held the Eucharist to be a commemorative sacrifice, and so do we. This is the constant language of the ancient liturgies. "We offer by way of commemoration, according to our Saviour's words when He ordained this holy rite, 'Do this in commemoration of me'"' (p. 225).

DODWELL.—'But that which more nearly concerns the design of this present way of reasoning is that those sacrifices and this high-priesthood of the Gospel were mystical; and so mystical as not only to signify, but also to perform what was, according to the sense of those times, to be expected from mysteries . . . And this also they did believe, and had not reason to believe themselves mistaken in believing so, that the Eucharist was the mystical sacrifice performing the same thing under the Gospel, as the external bloody sacrifices under the Law' (p. 245).

HICKES (whom Cardinal Newman represents as teaching no higher doctrine than that of 'a material sacrifice of bread and wine').—'This opinion, that there is no other "external material oblation" in the Christian religion, no "offering at God's altar, but only eating something that comes from it;" and that the mystical or sacramental Body and Blood of Christ of which we partake at the Lord's table "are not there offered up unto God," if there were no other reason, is to be rejected because it is new and contrary to the consentient belief and practice of all Churches for above fifteen hundred years' (p. 271.)

JOHNSON (to whom his Eminence ascribes the same doctrine as to Hickes).—'Since it appears that the Eucharistical elements are not only types but representatives, and that not only to man but to God; and since they are representatives of the only truly propi-

Digitized by Google

tiatory and expiatory sacrifice of the cross: I suppose it clearly follows that they also are a propitiatory and expiatory sacrifice; for otherwise they are no true and perfect representation' (p. 307).

Id.—'I suppose it will not bear a dispute whether our faith and confidence in the merits of Christ's death be more invigorated and confirmed by a bare remembrance, a solemn calling to mind, or by having the oblation by which he purchased these blessings put into our hands and mouths' (p. 319).

Id.—'It seems clear to me that the one personal oblation performed by our Saviour Himself is not to be confined to any one instant of time; but commenced with the Paschal solemnity, and was finished at His ascension into heaven, there to appear in the presence of God for us. . . . And if it was consistent with the one oblation to be made in the Holy of Holies as well as on the altar; in Heaven as well as on the cross; then I cannot conceive why the oblation made in the Eucharist should make the oblation cease to be one, any more than the double offering of it, on the cross and in the Holy of Holies' (p. 325).

WILSON.—'May it please Thee, O God, who hast called us to this ministry, to make us worthy to offer unto Thee this sacrifice for our own sins and for the sins of Thy people' (p. 357).

GLOCESTER RIDLEY.—'The Lord's Supper instituted in memory of Christ's death was itself a sacrifice, as much as any of the Jewish sacrifices were. It is no argument against it to say it is a memorial, and therefore no sacrifice; for amongst the Jews we find that the most consecrated part of the sacrifice is called a memorial' (p. 407).

So far the Tract. Add to these testimonies the innumerable devotional companions to the Christian Sacrifice, of which the public at many periods since the Reformation seemed as insatiable as at the present day. Of Lake's *Officium Eucharisticum*, twenty-seven editions were published between 1677 and 1724: of Horneck's '*Crucified Jesus*, a full account of the nature, end, design, and benefits of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper,' the sixth edition came out in 1716. And we find the author in his preface apologizing for adding another to the great number of such works already in circulation. We may name also Brett's *Christian Altar and Sacrifice;* Brevint's *Christian Sacrifice and Sacrament;* the Manuals of Bishop Patrick and Dr. Kettlewell; the *Companion to the Altar*, which was so popular, that it is hard to find an old pocket prayer-book of some dates that has not the Companion bound up with it. The *Whole Duty of Man*, which in its popularity, and the concealment of its authorship, is the English representative of the *Imitatio Christi*, has at the end some most fervent devotions for the Blessed Sacrament: 'Behold, O Lord, thy beloved Son, in whom Thou art well pleased;' at the receiving of the bread, 'By Thy cruci-

Digitized by Google

fied body deliver me from the body of this death;' at the receiving of the cup, 'O let this blood of Thine purge my conscience from dead works to serve the living God.' Dr. Newman himself edited the devotional manuals of Bishop Wilson and Bishop Andrewes; and wrote (to mention but one extract) the following in the translation of the Thursday prayers of the latter, 'By the Holy Body and precious Blood on the evening of this day, Lord have mercy.'

Be it remembered to what end we make these quotations. We do not deny that they may come short of what we ourselves believe, and may come further short of the belief of others. We do not deny that other passages of a different tendency may be readily found, often in the same authors. What we do assert is, that Cardinal Newman, in his extract from Waterland, has flagrantly misrepresented the nature of the Anglican tradition. He must be well aware that long before the publication of Tract 90, Mr. Palmer, in his work upon the Church, dedicated, by permission, to the Primates of England and Ireland, declared that we have no material fault to find with Bossuet's explanation of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice.[1]

One crucial instance, in conclusion, of what we mean by saying that the advocate of the *sacerdotium* holds toward our tradition a position not different from that which he holds toward the general progress of the doctrine in the Church at large. Here is an extract, not devotional, but controversial, not from any Anglo-Catholic source, but from Bishop Davenant, Calvinist of Calvinists, an English representative at the Synod of Dort:—

'We, on the other hand, assert, first, that nothing in the Mass can be named or shown which is capable of being sacrificed, or has the nature and essence of a real external sacrifice properly so called; although the prayers, alms, and thanksgivings are given the name of spiritual sacrifices; although also the representation itself of the Body and Blood of Christ, broken and poured out, is oftentimes figuratively called a sacrifice by the ancients.'[2]

Now what is the word to which we should point in that sentence as essentially marking its complete inadequacy? Would it not be the word *figuratively?* Let us mark, then, how the very same word is treated by Cardinal Newman when it occurs in the Patristic tradition:—

'The words of Tertullian, who explains, "This is My Body," by

[1] Palmer *On the Church*, vol. ii. p. 463 (2nd ed. 1839).
[2] Davenant, *Determinationes*, *Quæst.* xiii.

Digitized by Google

"a figure of My Body;" and of Origen, who speaks of "our drinking Christ's Blood, not only in the rite of the Sacraments, but also when we receive His discourses," and says that "that Bread which God the Word acknowledges as His Body is the word that nourishes souls"—passages which admit of a Catholic interpretation when the Catholic doctrine is once proved, but which *primâ facie* run counter to that doctrine.'[1]

In truth, the different measure which the great apostle of development deals out to his newer friends and to his older is not a pleasant intellectual spectacle. For them it is enough to show a hint in the past amid a thousand contradictions, and they are allowed to pass in the most gigantic novelties; while for us the demand is, Show that what you believe has been exactly in the same form believed by your predecessors, or confess yourselves no priests. It is useless for us to argue out the truth of our succession and the validity of our form, for 'antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts;' but we are to forget the urgency of visible facts when we see the appointed infallible guide of the nations turning heathen at the Renaissance, just when he was most wanted, and leaving the preservation of Christianity, even in his own Church, to be effected by a revolution. When a few Anglican clergy, against the express direction of their Church, treat the Eucharist with disrespect, we are to cry *O bone custos*, and deny their Orders; but when we read in Erasmus, and others of his time, as eloquent denunciations of the utter neglect of every duty of faith and morals on the part of whole nations of clergy, we are to regard these things as unimportant specks upon an undoubted pedigree.

We are far from desiring to turn this controversy into a personal question. But the reader will remember that Cardinal Newman has voluntarily assailed a truth which is vital to our existence as a Church. And we think ourselves fully entitled, without being accused of captiousness or disrespect, to make the following remark. In the prosecution of his assault, Cardinal Newman pledges himself to this belief on a point of history: that Anglican doctrine upon the Christian sacrifice does not rise higher than in the quotation from Waterland, the highest point of which is the sacrifice of faith and hope in commemorating the Great Sacrifice. Now, when Dr. Newman was an Anglican, he and all the party of which he was a leader maintained most distinctly that Anglican doctrine had as matter of history risen to a far higher point than Waterland. Waterland was never an authority with

[1] *Essay on Development*, p. 24.

Digitized by Google

them. To compress the matter into one sentence, we find these words in the *Apologia* (p. 181): 'I claimed in behalf of who would, that he might hold in the Anglican Church . . . the Mass all but Transubstantiation with Andrewes; or with Hooker that Transubstantiation itself is not a point for churches to part communion upon.' Now the change of belief which drew the illustrious writer from among us may perhaps have implied a persuasion that such doctrine as that of Andrewes was after all not tenable in the English Church. But it can in no wise be taken to imply any change of belief on the simple historical fact that Andrewes did thus teach something far beyond Waterland. Contrariwise, we find in the same work the following declaration upon the kindred point that there is a visible Church with sacraments and rites which are channels of invisible grace (p. 121): 'I thought that this was the doctrine of Scripture, of the early Church, and of the Anglican Church. Here, again, I have not changed in opinion; I am as certain now on this point as I was in 1833, and have never ceased to be certain.' How then are we to account for the fact that the Anglican tradition rises to the Mass all but Transubstantiation, or sinks to the sacrifice of faith and hope, according to the exigencies of the Cardinal's present argument? Can it be that the habit of saying the things required by his position, which formerly produced utterances against Rome, is now producing utterances against Anglicanism? It is no moral blessing, but an immense moral calamity, when a habit of thinking what one's controversial position requires, and saying it, obtains the sanction of infallibility, and so passes beyond reformation, probably beyond consciousness.

Of course we can readily anticipate the answer which Romanists would make to our claim for liberty of development. They would say, in the first place, that liberty of development under infallible authority gives no sanction to development without it. To which we should reply that the inherent necessity of perfecting a revealed doctrine up to the revealed point is the only authority for development which possesses any analogy with the evolution of thought in other subjects; that the imagination of such inherent necessity is in fact the sanction under which Roman developments have always been made, of which the development of their infallible authority itself is an eminent instance, and that in any case the authority of this inherent necessity of truth is the only one we claim for our advances in Sacerdotal doctrine, and is a sufficient one. This answer we have merely anticipated,

Digitized by Google

but another is actually hinted at in one or two passages of Mr. Hutton's book, in which he seems indistinctly to foresee our use of the development argument:—

'They who draw a parallel between the Anglican Ordination rites and those of the East, to which reference has been made, forget the essential difference between a form which has remained undeveloped in consequence of its having been in early times cut off from participation in that vigorous life which is characteristic of the Roman Church, and another which has become what it is through a wilful abandonment of the known truth after this development had been fully accomplished' (p. 167; see also p. 94).

Now the reader, of course, perceives that this answer assumes the whole Roman system, and is without weight to any one who has not accepted it. If there was anything in the Roman system as it presented itself to the writers of the Anglican tradition, which was not a perfectly legitimate development of primitive ideas, the answer falls to the ground. Nay, it is not necessary to determine whether the aspect in which they viewed Roman doctrine was just or mistaken. Mr. Hutton, in several places, argues that the Reformers well knew the true Roman doctrine and rejected it. However, it is perfectly certain, by the continuous and unanimous agreement of all Anglican controversialists, that they viewed the practical system of Masses in the Roman Church, by which applications of the Divine Sacrifice were separately effective and obtainable by the material means of sale and purchase, as irreconcileable with the unity and spirituality of the great Atonement. We cannot honestly say we think them wrong. But whether they were right or wrong, the shock and injury caused by opposition and protest, the excess upon one side through revulsion against an excess fancied or real upon the other, are familiar features of the progress of all developments, and may be matched from every struggle after truth in which the Church has ever been engaged.

Thus much upon the historical legitimacy of sacerdotal doctrine in the English Church. A more important point still is the appropriateness of the instrument which the Eucharistic office of the Church places in the hands of the priest for the exercise of his function. Now it is agreed that in our English rite there is much to desire; but our desire is entirely for the presence of clearer words than we find, not for the removal of any thing which is there. It seems to be conceded that the language of the service is consistent with the Real Presence. If so, it is consistent with the Real Sacrifice. And not only is there not a word to con-

Digitized by Google

tradict that belief, but the prayer for acceptance of our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the accompanying and dependent petition for remission of sins for us and the whole Church, *must* be applied by any one who believes the Real Presence to that great fact. On the other hand the Roman Church (even if priestly functions were expressed in her words of Ordination, which we have shown not to be the case) places in the hands of her priests a Canon of the Mass, which cannot honestly be reconciled with belief either in the Real Presence or the Real Sacrifice.

In the *Ordo Missæ* we find the prayer, 'Suscipe, Sancte Pater,' which beseeches God to receive this immaculate Host for the living and the dead. But the consecration is at that point still to come, and 'this Host' is but bread. At the beginning of the Canon we have the prayer 'Te igitur,' which beseeches Him to receive and bless these gifts 'which we offer to Him.' But 'these gifts' are still but bread. When the consecration has indeed been effected, we come to that which, if it existed in our Liturgy, would be proclaimed an absolute disproof of any true belief, sacramental or sacrificial; for the prayer is that God would receive the bread of life and the cup of salvation, 'as He deigned to receive the gifts of righteous Abel and the sacrifice of the Patriarch Abraham, and that which His High Priest Melchizedek presented to Him.' 'What a comparison,' exclaims Bishop Thirlwall, 'when Jesus Christ Himself is supposed to be on the altar.' Were those Old Testament sacrifices, which are made the models of what we expect from ours, spiritual and propitiatory for the living and the dead? But what follows is still far more anomalous. There is reason and meaning in the petition of our Liturgy of 1549, that (*not* the memorial sacrifice itself, but) our prayers and supplications should be brought up by the hand of God's holy angel before His divine Majesty;[1] but what can be the meaning of begging God to 'command *these*' (the bread of life and cup of salvation) 'to be carried by the hands of His holy angel to His altar above,' upon the theory either that the priest is offering the Holy Body and Blood really and substantially present here below, or that

[1] Thus the *Liturgy of S. Mark* makes the same petition in respect to the incense; *S. James*, to the spiritual unbloody sacrifice before consecration; *S. Clement*, after consecration, to the 'gift that is offered to the Lord God;' *S. Chrysostom*, to the 'supplication of us sinners' (this Liturgy probably gave the precedent for the Book of 1549); *S. Basil*, to the reasonable and unbloody sacrifice before consecration. Of these S. Clement alone affords any precedent for the Roman, and that a doubtful one.

Digitized by Google

the same true Body of Christ is already at God's right hand in heaven? And then over the sacred Body and Blood the priest prays for various blessings, 'through Christ our Lord: through whom, O Lord, thou dost ever create, sanctify, vivify, and bless all these good things,' signing the host and chalice with the cross; thus clearly distinguishing them from the Lord Jesus, through whom God is said to bless them, and presuming to give an additional blessing to that which is already the source of blessing itself.

This brief notice may convey to the reader some little notion of the miserable poverty, not to say false doctrine, of the Roman Canon of the Mass. But we cannot undertake to impress him with the full extent of the truth upon this point, unless he will read the work of some Roman commentator upon the Missal, and observe the desperate straits to which he is driven to torture its language into harmony with the accepted doctrine of his Church. Thus Cardinal Bona[1] assumes, in utter defiance of grammar, that when the priest says 'jube hæc perferri in sublime altare,' *hæc* refers, not to the 'ipsa corporis et sanguinis Christi mysteria,' but to the vows, faith, and prayers of the faithful; which antecedents not one word in the preceding sentence authorizes him to introduce. The same eminent writer gives us the explanation of the use of the words, 'Thou dost ever create, sanctify, and vivify all these good things,' and the accompanying sign of the cross made over the consecrated elements; the fact being that both words and gesture originally referred to first-fruits, such as grapes, milk, and honey, which in old times were then offered and blessed; and this ceremony having ceased, the blessing is monstrously transferred to the Body and Blood of the Lord. Bona explains that the words refer not *only* to the Oblations, but also to the things then blessed. But Sala, his commentator, protests that the Sacrifice cannot be understood by 'bona hæc,' declares that some refer the words to the Eucharist, some to it and the first-fruits, some to the latter alone; and gives some ridiculous *ex-post-facto* attempts to explain the words in defiance of their history, as referring to the divine creation of the Presence.[2]

Add to all this the serious misquotation of Our Lord in the very words of consecration, by which Transubstantiation is thought to be effected. He did *not*, according to any of the Bible accounts, say what the Missal asserts He did say; 'Take and eat *all of it*;' or 'Take and drink all of it, for this

[1] *De Reb. Liturg.* lib. ii. cap. xiii.
[2] Bona, *De Reb. Lit.*, ed. Sala, vol. iii. p. 317.

Digitized by Google

is the cup of my blood, of the new *and eternal* testament, *the mystery of faith, which shall be shed* for you and for many.'

On the whole, if any English priest feels discontented with the Communion Office of his Church, we recommend him strongly to study the Roman Missal, and observe there what others have to endure. He has but to give to all the words of his own Office the fullest meaning, and he has a form which, to apply Canon Estcourt's words on another subject (p. 198), is 'so expressed as not to exclude a due and proper intention on the part of the minister of the sacrament.' But the minister of the Roman rite had better avoid with all his power attending to the natural meaning of the words which he is using; for they are thoroughly unfit to express the intention which every Roman priest must have in order to make the sacrament valid. And when Mr. Hutton and others his fellows charge the Ritualists with adding by vestments and ceremonies an air to their Eucharistic office which does not properly belong to it, the taunt violently recoils upon themselves. For the Roman rite, with and without its rubrics, accessories, and later additions, reminds us of nothing so much as of two companion sketches which we have somewhere seen of the poor old Grand Monarque with and without his royal robes.

All that we have said concerning comparative security under the Roman and Anglican systems applies in the fullest sense to the question of personal episcopal descent. We have not space to treat at any length the subject of Parker's consecration. We shall but remark that the supposition that Barlow was unconsecrated—which, if true, must, as Mr. Hutton allows, have been known to Parker—presents to us in the latter one of the strangest moral paradoxes ever known; a man nervously anxious about the perfect legality of his own consecration rites, yet careless whether this primary requisite had been observed in the case of his chief consecrator; choosing, when he might just as easily have asked any other bishop to officiate, to go through life with this consciousness of unreality resting upon his own conscience, and liable to be thrown in his teeth by any enemy who might be in possession of a fact accessible to anybody at the time. And then we have to assume the Roman paradox or *placitum*, that when three or more bishops are concerned in a consecration the presiding one alone really consecrates. The comparatively late origin of this theory has been sufficiently shown by Dr. Lee, in his work on English Ordinations (pp. 168, 229), and is illustrated by Canon Bright in his chapters on English Church History (p. 213). And on this unauthorized assumption,

Digitized by Google

we may remark, depends Mr. Hutton's assertion (p. 409) that Canon Bright is 'wrong' in omitting to recognize a new stock in English Episcopacy, through the consecration of John Stratford by Cardinal Vitalis in 1323. It is hardly fair to accuse an author of error where he is known to maintain a principle upon which the error is no error at all.

The treatment which the Irish succession receives from Mr. Hutton is worth mention. He is—

'unable to ascertain whether it descends in an independent line from Curwen, the Archbishop of Dublin, who apostatized on the accession of Elizabeth. The orders of the present bishops all centre in Dr. Beresford, who was consecrated Bishop of Cork in 1805 and translated to Armagh in 1822. Who his consecrator was the writer cannot discover: but should it have been the Hon. William Stuart, Archbishop of Armagh, who had been translated from St. David's in 1800 . . . the existing Irish succession can be traced only in that single line which ends in Barlow.'

Mr. Hutton's inability to ascertain must not be taken to imply that he has made any inquiries. He must have wished his readers to remain under this impression, on the supposition that few of them would care to inquire further. For, had he cared enough about the point to question anybody acquainted with Irish matters (Dr. Brady for instance, whom in one place he quotes), or even any London bookseller, he could not fail to have been at least referred to that extremely common book, Cotton's *Fasti Ecclesiæ Hibernicæ*, the well-known authority on all questions of the kind. There he might have traced, upon the Roman system of giving only the chief consecrator, the following ecclesiastical pedigree of the late Primate Beresford: Beresford; Brodrick (Archbishop of Cashel); Beresford (Archbishop of Tuam); Robinson (Archbishop of Armagh); Cobbe (Archbishop of Dublin); Synge (Archbishop of Tuam); Palliser (Archbishop of Cashel); Marsh (Archbishop of Dublin); Price (Archbishop of Cashel); Margetson (Archbishop of Dublin); Bramhall (Archbishop of Armagh); Ussher (Archbishop of Armagh); Hampton (Archbishop of Armagh); Jones (Archbishop of Dublin); Loftus (Archbishop of Dublin); Curwen (Archbishop of Dublin), who was consecrated by Bonner, Bishop of London, A.D. 1555. It appears then, that in arguing with Irish clergy, three of the six doubts which Mr. Hutton (p. 368) propounds as to English Orders must be omitted. And the fact has a not unimportant bearing on the general argument. The basis of Mr. Hutton's whole book is the apparent absence of sacerdotal consciousness in the conduct of Anglican clergy.

Digitized by Google

The insufficiency of their Ordination is offered as a cause sufficient to account for this fact. Now Mr. Hutton himself intimates (p. 321, *note*) that the Irish Church is the part of the Anglican communion which has shown the smallest amount of sacerdotal consciousness. And that Church, it seems, is entirely free from any connexion with Parker's Orders. It does not therefore appear why any flaw in Parker's succession, proved as it is not to be an operative cause in Ireland, should be offered as an account of far less unsacerdotal phenomena in England.

Now compare all this with the case of the Roman succession :—

'Accepting as we do the position that the succession is continued in single lines, and not by way of threefold interlacing cords, we have to maintain that each bishop in the chain which historically connects, say, Cardinal Manning with the Apostles, was validly baptized, validly ordained to the priesthood, and validly consecrated to the Episcopate. . . . It must be allowed that this position is, humanly speaking, indefensible. But Catholics are, nevertheless, absolutely certain that they have the true ministerial succession, inasmuch as that is as indefectible as is the Church herself' (p. 523).

And in a note we have a further explanation of this doctrine of Final Perseverance in the succession, exactly corresponding to Calvinism in its disregard of human acts through faith in a general divine promise :—

'Catholics of course are not called upon to hold that in no single case has there been a bishop who for lack of valid baptism, ordination, or consecration, was a bishop only in name. But they may well believe that the government of the Church would be so providentially ordered as to hinder such a person from being called on to continue the succession. It falls to the lot of comparatively few bishops to act as the principal consecrator of others.'

Wonderful! In the first place we should have supposed that the fact of few bishops being called upon to consecrate, would be a step further in the process of putting all the eggs in one basket, which the Roman system involves: the fewer they are, the wider would be the blank, and the more difficult to remedy, which one *hiatus* would cause. Nero's wish would be fulfilled, and the whole Roman people have but one neck. In the next place it seems, that though Catholics are, of course, not required to deny that an unreal bishop might occupy a see, nullify all his ordinations of priests, and entail upon his flock all the consequences thence resulting, yet that he will infallibly be hindered from acting as consecrator, and so

Digitized by Google

spreading to another diocese only the very same infection which he has spread unhindered in his own. If we might venture to advise, we should suggest to persons who desire to apply this principle, that they should go in for the whole theory that there never has been a mock bishop at all.

Add to the difficulties of personal succession those resulting from the doctrine of intention. Firstly, intention in the minister of ordination is required in such a sense that an atheistical or heretical bishop ordains in vain, unless he have (what is to our minds quite inconceivable in such a man) a general though feeble intention of giving to the ordinands what they came to receive. You might as well talk of a man, engaged in passing sovereigns which he knows to be base, having a general feeble intention of giving good ones. Secondly, we learn from Father Togni (quoted in Mr. Hutton's appendix) that intention in the ordinand is required to this extent, that one who neither consents nor dissents, but only permits himself to be ordained, renders (according to Benedict XIV.) the ordination void. Let us remember what manner of men, and with what manner of objects, were ordained, and were ordainers, during (say) the period of the Renaissance in Italy, and ask ourselves whether there is the least possibility of Italian Orders having survived under such requirements.

It is no exaggeration to say, upon a review of the whole question, that all the doubts which have been alleged against Anglican Orders, were they multiplied tenfold, would not equal those which upon Roman principles rest upon the Roman. But all this gives very little trouble either to Mr. Hutton or to Cardinal Newman. For 'Catholics believe their Orders valid because they are members of the true Church; and Anglicans believe they belong to the true Church because their Orders are valid.'[1]

But on what then does the Roman claim practically rest? Not, it seems, upon the succession. Certainly not upon continuity of doctrine; it would be very perilous for believers in the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility to place that in the foreground of their claim. Not, we may be sure, upon the subjective necessity which the mind feels for infallible guidance; for some minds have quite other and even opposite subjective needs. Upon what then? Upon 'the great note of an ever enduring *Cætus fidelium*, with a fixed organization, a unity of jurisdiction, a political greatness, a continuity of existence in all places and times, a suitability to all

[1] Newman, *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 87.

Digitized by Google

classes, ranks, and callings, an ever energizing life, an untiring, ever evolving history, which is her evidence that she is the creation of God, and the representative and home of Christianity.' Which description is in many points a most extravagant view of the place of the Roman Church in history. But take it at its best, what is it but a magnified instance of that very same claim of being in possession and having the strength of possession, that presumption derivable from prosperity, which Cardinal Newman, in his preface to Mr. Hutton (pp. vii. viii.), regards as natural but highly precarious arguments when advanced by Anglicans.[1]

No, it is all in vain that these controversialists attempt to draw a distinction between the grounds of reason on which their claim and ours are founded. We cannot recognize even meaning in Mr. Hutton's assertion (p. 443) that the 'Catholic religion rests on a simpler basis than an essentially controversial system like the Anglican.' In what respect is their basis simpler; in what respect are we more controversial? If it be grounds of reason that we compare, they must confess our orders by many degrees the stronger. If they would assume different ground from ours, it must be a ground of unreason. And to this, indeed, it comes. Mr. Hutton's Catholic rests on a determination of the will to believe that which the intellect at the same time tells him is doubtful, or even untrue. That this is, indeed, his 'simple basis' we fully perceive when he says (p. 436) that 'the position which a Catholic pastor holds to his flock is one of infallibility, and that on rational grounds, the infallibility of the Church being assumed, for he is to them her representative.' We grant that the infallibility of all priests is the proper completion of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, the only thing that could make that endowment, now so distant, difficult, and doubtful in its method of exercise, available for the practical guidance of the faithful. But the infallibility of priests is not true; the most ignorant Roman Catholic knows that it is not true; and the make-belief that it is true can only be kept up by the deliberate subjection of the intellect to the will.

But this opinion upon the practical position of the individual to the Church, in the relation which alone touches his everyday life, shows to us very plainly what Mr. Hutton's whole conception of his position towards the Church must be. As the Roman Catholic is taught to think and feel regarding his own parish priest, so will he think and feel towards his Church in her more distant regions; and whatever unreality

[1] Newman, *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 88.

Digitized by Google

or untruthfulness there be in the nearer connexion, the same will there be all through the more distant. If the one consist in treating a man as infallible who is known not to be so, the other will consist also in similar deceptions and pretences self-imposed. No wonder then that Mr. Hutton's book is so thoroughly untruthful, that he uses argument where he thinks it will serve, and disclaims argument where he thinks that the more expedient course; that any misrepresentation seems justifiable which is likely to induce acceptance of his foregone conclusion; that alternate coaxing, and scaring, and whispering of scandal seems to him the proper method of dealing with grown men; that he recognizes no flaw in his own Church, but regards the Rome of the Renaissance, with Alexander VI. for its topmost bough, as a glorious growth and completion of the tender shoot of primitive Christianity.

The whole system is unreal from the root. It gives no consistent account of the place in which it sets the reason and the conscience of man; and it certainly does not make up in spirituality for its want of human reason. We have never read a book more entirely unreligious than this. It wanders among the rules and precedents of the Church on earth and never raises our eyes beyond. Among all the difficulties which it ascribes to the faith of the English priest it never conceives him making an act of confidence in the Lord, who is the Church's Head, and believing that Orders conferred in His words and with the best recurrence to His very example which His servants could compass will not by Him be suffered to be vain.

Modern Romanists seem content to rest the proof of their religion upon the evident divine guidance which they suppose themselves to discern in the history of the Roman Church, to the neglect of all connexion with either the miracles, moral teaching, or spiritual phenomena, of New Testament times. They cut the cable and sail away in the bark of Peter from all the Christian past; and because their crew are all *ipso facto* pledged not to permit themselves to doubt, they proclaim loudly that they alone can offer protection against infidelity. A suicidal pretence! The rest for the mind and for the soul which the present gifts of the Church afford are great and sufficient indeed, if you connect them with the wonders and with the promises of the New Testament: apart from these they are completely unsatisfying to any inquiring intellect or any earnest soul. Consider, then, how self-destructive is the claim to establish the Christian ministry on other foundations than those of the New Testament, and to require

Digitized by Google

for its validity a prominence of sacerdotalism in its calling and appointment, which was not required in the first age. We are not without considerable information in that Book upon the subject of the Christian ministry. We have the Lord's charge to His Apostles as the first priests; S. Paul's to Timothy and Titus as the first bishops. These the Reformers, with a heaven-sent wisdom, utilized for our ordination forms. We have many scattered directions in the Acts and Epistles pointing forward to the succeeding link in the chain of succession. But we nowhere find the sacerdotal character ascribed to the Christian ministry save as matter of inference. And when we illustrate the New Testament by the most ancient ordinals and records of the ministry in Church history, this impression is deepened. If any one claims that the Christian ministry is something so great and so divinely sanctioned that it must needs include the sacerdotal character as a part of its contents, the position is impregnable. Far otherwise if he puts forward the sacerdotal character as to such a degree the sole or chief distinctive mark of the ministry that a true ministry cannot be instituted without mention of this. Then the decisive objection occurs that there can have been no true ministry for the first three centuries. Cardinal Newman's 'surely it is too awful a gift to be transmitted in silence' condemns the New Testament or is by the New Testament condemned. Let none mention development in such a case as this. There is no development of wholly new species among the Christian institutions. The doctrine of each of the Sacraments has been developed; but neither in the case of Baptism nor the Holy Eucharist has the Church ever made the monstrous claim which Mr. Hutton makes for her in the case of Order; a claim to change the terms on which one of the covenant gifts of the New Law can be sought for or obtained from on high.

We deliberately asserted, and we repeat the accusation, that the conduct of Rome as to the Anglican rites demonstrates that the idea of Holy Order is not to her a reality. The statement astonishes Mr. Hutton, because of the contrast between Catholic treatises *de Ordine* and 'the lame, incoherent, contradictory, and unreal utterances of Anglican divines on the same subject.' 'What!' he exclaims of us, 'cannot ignorance combined with prejudice produce?' But, with much gratitude for his politeness, we must remind him that the particular branch of the subject of Orders now before us is the manner in which they are conferred. And upon this point it is confessed that the Roman Church is without full

Digitized by Google

light. Cardinal Newman tells us of a Pope who prayed for such light, but admits that it has not yet come.[1] Our readers have already some reason to perceive that the Roman authorities are lame, incoherent, contradictory, and unreal in this matter to a high degree. And had we room to tell more of their variations and inconsistencies in relation to the Anglican controversy alone, a number of other adjectives would be needed to express their character, while Anglicans, on the other hand, have conducted the discussion on clear and catholic grounds. But were it otherwise, we are so ignorant and prejudiced as to prefer practice to profession. The Scribes and Pharisees classified moral duties with much system, and many thought it ignorance and prejudice to suppose that morality was not very real to them. But they said, and did not.

The Roman treatises may be as lawyerlike as Privy Council judgments; we shall not therefore infer that a spirit of reality and justice rules them, so long as they lead to the palpably indefensible practice of treating doubtful Orders as null, while an infallible method of deciding upon their validity lies still unused. Suppose an author indites such a sentence as this, 'Many of these' converts 'have been married, or have otherwise found no vocation for the priesthood, so that the question of their Orders never called for consideration' (p. 123); that would be proof that Order was not to his mind a reality. For otherwise it would show that he did not care how many souls his Church sent to destruction by treating them as free when perhaps they were vowed to God, so that only her own external arrangements were not interfered with.

To Mr. Hutton it seems a small matter whether a sacramental covenant made with God be recognized or not. Should scrupulous converts desire to be ordained conditionally they are to reflect (p. 470) 'how almost inappreciably what they demand would differ from what is ordinarily done,' 'to remember that a bishop may fairly be considered tacitly to intend only to administer the sacrament to those who are capable of receiving it,' and that 'anyhow there is nothing to hinder the ordinand from presenting himself with a special condition in his own mind, supposing him to be invincibly prejudiced in favour of his Anglican Orders.' And as for a convert in Orders who does not seek the priesthood of Rome—

'No doubt if his prejudice in favour of Anglican Orders should ob-

[1] *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 83.

Digitized by Google

stinately cling to him after he has been received into the Church, it might embarrass him in his choice of employment as a Catholic. But it would be strange if some experience of the great reality that sacred orders are within the Church, as contrasted with the uncertain character of their nominal counterpart outside, did not convince him that in relation to the Catholic priesthood he is but a layman, and as such free to adopt any legitimate secular profession' (p. 23).

We find this minimizing of the significance of moral acts thoroughly repulsive. It is just what we might expect from an emissary of heathen instead of Christian Rome. 'Only the little act which makes an outward denial of Christ's call; only a few grains of incense before the Emperor's bust; make what mental reservations you please; and you may be sure that among your new associations you will forget any remaining scruples which might recall to you the despised community of Christians which you will have left.'

But our space is exhausted. Mr. Hutton may perhaps know better than we what is likely to produce an effect upon minds already in the condition of fascination which precedes devouring by the Roman cobra. But sure we are that to healthy minds such a work will be the strongest condemnation of the system which has produced it.

To the Eminent introducer of the book we shall but venture to tender the humble counsel, henceforth to content himself with his own splendid literary progeny, and renounce the office of sponsor for the children of other men's brain, and our hope that he may live to write that which may efface from the minds of honest Englishmen the remembrance of his disingenuous preface. Sorry should we be to suppose that this perversion, not only of facts, but of his own recorded convictions, was to be his last word to the English Church. Let us try to imagine that he was led by his sympathetic nature to supply an introduction in harmony—too great harmony for his reputation—with the work of his friend.

ART. X.—ASHWELL'S LIFE OF WILBERFORCE.

Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford and afterwards of Winchester. By A. R. ASHWELL, late Canon of Chichester. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. (London: Murray, 1880.)

THE historian who may be bold enough to grapple with the great work of chronicling the English Church Revival of the

Digitized by Google

nineteenth century will welcome with gratitude the abundant help to be found in the many lives of actors in that memorable series of events which have successively appeared. Among autobiographies more or less complete, he will find those of R. H. Froude, J. H. Newman, G. A. Denison, and Sir Gilbert Scott. Of lives by other hands, though generally weaving in much autobiographical matter, the long procession is successively recruited by Stanley's *Arnold*, Blomfield's *Blomfield*, Churton's *Joshua Watson*, Sweet's *Henry Hoare*, Beckett's *Lonsdale*, Neale's *Torry*, Coleridge's *Keble*, Goodwin's *Mackenzie*, Armstrong's *Armstrong*, Miss Yonge's *Patteson*, Gray's *Gray*, Stephens's *Hook*, Tucker's *Selwyn*, Miss Milman's *Bishop Milman*, and by *Catherine and Craufurd Tait*. Of those who have never been so commemorated, Bishop Phillpotts' life is conspicuously absent, and as William Scott (himself without any memoir) is dead, we are at a loss to name any one fit to undertake it. Neither has any sufficient record been produced of one who was much greater than the general world was aware, Bishop Forbes of Brechin.

Among these, although it be but a torso, Canon Ashwell's graceful, laborious, impartial, scholarlike, and affectionate memoir of Samuel Wilberforce will take no mean place, as a pen picture, resembling those harmonious and dignified family portraits by Lawrence which adorn so many of our country-houses. In the portrait by Lawrence you have every feature carefully studied and the whole personage displayed in some typical attitude of public usefulness and official dignity. And if the idea which the spectators can gather of the great man's undress life be vague and incomplete, the artist may reasonably reply that, if his subject had not been statesman or commander, judge or prelate, the picture might never have been ordered, and that he was therefore only fulfilling his mandate when he perpetuated his subject in the character which had been the cause of his own employment.

Canon Ashwell, we believe, had never been Bishop Wilberforce's chaplain; but their acquaintance commenced when he was head of the Training College at Culham, in the diocese of Oxford, and always seems to have continued on a basis congruous with that beginning. Rather than complain that the feeling of being in the presence of 'Monseigneur' so often peeps out in his pages, we should admire the courage and perspicacity of one who had so far, though not quite completely, shaken off that sort of influence which is so embarrassing to the honest biographer. He has not indeed risen to be a Boswell, but he is not one of the Auctores Panegyrici.

Digitized by Google

Besides, we must always bear in mind that it is not quite fair to condemn an unfinished work for shortcomings which might have been materially rectified in later volumes. Our fear is that, even if there should have been a chapter of supplementary and domestic details, the information therein contained could neither have been so felicitously put, so instructive, or so clear, as if it had been incorporated at the proper chronological place. For example, the Bishop's most unrestrained, and therefore most valuable, letters, are to a lady, Miss Louisa Noel, whom he styles 'sister;' yet there is no word in text or note to enable the reader to identify the correspondent, who was, in fact, the daughter of the Hon. and Rev. Gerard Noel, Vicar of Romsey, and who, having been the early friend of Mrs. Samuel Wilberforce, spent the last years of an invalid life in a cottage at Lavington. Not a single letter is printed, either from Archdeacon Robert or from Henry Wilberforce, nor any sketch given of those two most interesting and picturesque men; one of them in learning much superior to Samuel, the other in many attributes of natural brilliancy not far behind him, if only he had cultivated himself equally. Nor is there one letter to or from Mrs. Samuel Wilberforce printed; but we must conclude, if any of these have been preserved, that the biographer could not have been a free agent in so curious a suppression. Neither is there anything to particularize what we are told were the lady's great charms, except one reference by the widower to a print as being like her, of S. Catherine borne by angels, which was clearly by his description, though neither the Bishop nor his biographer says so, that of Luini's delicious Lunette now in the Brera Gallery at Milan.

Unhappily a memoir such as this one is, just in proportion to the ability and success of its execution, makes the production of any volume of characteristics (supposing the man to live who could execute it) more improbable. A review in the *Quarterly* has made some contributions to such a collection, and a clever and genial, though hardly successful, attempt to inventory Samuel Wilberforce has been published in the *Fortnightly Review* by Lord Houghton, whose long and brilliant literary career exhibited him, in the full glow of youthful fervour, the bold, wise, and witty defender of the *Oxford Tracts* just after their suppression consequent on Tract 90, in his too little remembered 'One Tract More,' while he still condescends to pose as the Whig patron of an Established Church, provided it is not overrun with accessible bishops or vexed with frequent confirmations. But something longer and

Digitized by Google

more solid than Lord Houghton's article ought to have been, but will, we fear, never be, written.

This first of three intended volumes leaves off in the forty-third year of Samuel Wilberforce's life and the third of his Episcopate, and it can be profitably divided into three heads of unequal length, but of clearly definable and distinct purpose. The whole life's chronicle of Samuel Wilberforce—man, priest, and bishop—is summed up in the introductory chapter; and in the latter portion of the volume very important details upon his opinions and practical work as a bishop are given in a letter of singular interest contributed by the Bishop of Ely, which, while formally dealing with his ordinations only, really leads up to general inferences, which, as for sixteen years his examining chaplain, Bishop Woodford is peculiarly capable of handling. The bulk of the book, as we have seen, only carries the subject of the biography through the responsibilities of Rector of Brighstone, Canon of Winchester, Archdeacon of Surrey, Rector of Alverstoke, and for a few months Dean of Westminster, to place him upon the throne of Oxford; while the third and last part is the history of a few weeks only, but of weeks made memorable and wretched by the Hampden incident.

We shall so far invert this order of subjects as first to take up the second head, using the conclusions which we shall thereby reach as safe guides towards the solution of the wider question involved in the former one.

We can offer no higher praise to the memory of Canon Ashwell, for the fulness and fairness of his treatment of his subject, and for the honesty and discernment with which he has selected his illustrative matter, than by saying that, while we believe that he has constructed the key to the character and actions of his hero during the earlier years of his life—those of parish priest, Archdeacon, Dean, and neophyte-Bishop—on a somewhat conventional basis, and now and then shown a disposition to 'betray the succours' which a reason like his own was surely ready and prompt to offer, he still should have in his own narrative provided abundant material for a contrary and a more sound conclusion. It is curious that Canon Ashwell should have imagined that he found evidence of Wilberforce having been not only a Churchman, but a High Churchman, from the fact of his College friendship with R. H. Froude, J. H. Newman, and Frederick Oakeley, the two latter having originally been Evangelicals of an even more pronounced type than himself, while of Froude, after the publication of his 'Remains,' he spoke with absolute bitterness.

Digitized by Google

The biographer's contention, and we may add the entire tone of his very interesting references to the Tractarian period, bring home with a clearness, in which we confess that the fact never before shone out to us, the breach of continuity in the traditionary history of the Church movement on its personal side, produced by that which we can sufficiently indicate as the Littlemore cataclysm. To pass over the venerable and exceptional name of one still working in the same post of Academic and Cathedral dignity to which he had been called even before the *Oxford Tracts* had been so much as thought of, in an eastern and in a western county, and in at least one palace neither east nor west, may still be found men universally honoured, still grave in council and vigorous of mind, and one still further to the west, as vigorous although in dignified retirement, all of whom won their spurs as brigadiers in the Tractarian fight. To those just a little younger but weighty men in those far-off years, who are yet among us in places of high trust, we will not advert. After them comes the phalanx of respectable persons, who were undergraduates or upper-form boys during the Tractarian epoch, and on whose minds, with more or less of distinctness, the feelings no less than the facts of that memorable period are indelibly impressed. But, a little younger than these by a few years, come the men—now 'potent, grave, and reverend seniors,' and yet, for all that, not so very old—a generation whose personal confidence, enthusiasm, fealty, and hope for the future of the Church of England, have never been centred in the mighty individuality of John Henry Newman: men to whom John Henry Newman has always been an antagonist, though first and noblest of antagonists; who never joyed in possessing him, trembled for fear of losing him, or mourned when he had indeed departed. To this category belonged Canon Ashwell, who graduated at Caius College, Cambridge, as Fifteenth Wrangler in 1847. Talk with any of these men of any man or measure dating back not more than thirty or thirty-five years, and you will find that he and his little older associate approach the question from a similar point of view, supposing both to be High Churchmen. But carry back the discussion to beyond 1845, and it will probably appear that to one of them a world exists where the other only appreciates the misty visions of uncertain tradition. There are, of course, still more youthful Churchmen, whose question is 'When did the world first begin to talk of Ritualism?' to whom the thirties and the forties are to an infinitely more exaggerated degree fabulous and præ-historic.

Digitized by Google

Well, among all these excellent Churchmen of the later generations, an attractive and picturesque myth has very naturally taken root, and assumed definite and large proportions, of a Samuel Wilberforce always a High Churchman and leader of a moderate section of the party, growing indeed in his ecclesiastical stature as the time went on, but always an adherent, however independent, of what may generally be described as the Tractarian school. This, however, is not the recollection of those whose memory carries them back to the Tractarian and paulo-post-Tractarian days; and to them, accordingly, many of the incidents recalled by the present volume merely revive in perhaps a somewhat abrupt manner these dim old impressions, which are, as we little doubt, unpleasant and perplexing to younger men. Canon Ashwell, an elder among the juniors, seems unfortunately to have striven to construct a theory which should reconcile the personal Wilberforce of the Bishop's contemporaries with the ideal hero of a younger generation, always High Church, although inexplicably separated in his earlier days from other High Churchmen, not from merely such as Newman, but even from such as Hook.

On the hypothesis of this mythical High Churchmanship, many of Wilberforce's sayings and actions between 1835 and 1845, as recorded by our faithful chronicler, would be, more than we care to recapitulate, puzzling, inconsistent, and indefensible: the unmeasured language about R. H. Froude, for instance; the depreciation of Newman's *Justification;* the denunciation in the case of Isaac Williams of that doctrine of 'reserve' which Wilberforce himself adopted on the Sunday question; the vehement support of Mr. Garbett as Poetry Professor; the horror at Hook's appeal to High Churchmen to rally as a party; and the vote for stripping Mr. Ward of his degree. The removal of this misunderstanding is necessary to vindicate the fair fame of Samuel Wilberforce not less than the loyalty to the Church of those who were then really High Churchmen. They could hardly have been in the right, if his line were to pass unchallenged. Let it be fairly acknowledged that during all this period Wilberforce was not a High Churchman according to the only definition of that word which the events of that half-century allow us to affix to it, and as men such as Marriott, Hook, Mill, and Mozley accepted it, and then all distressing perplexities cease, while the impossibility of reconciling his deeds with his supposed party obligations disappears. In a man of active, earnest piety who was not a High Churchman there is nothing to puzzle,

Digitized by Google

nothing that is not consistent, nothing which calls for defence, in the course of action which we find carried out by Wilberforce. He may or he may not have been well counselled, but he was unamenable to cavil or reproach. But in compensation, every speech and every action which appreciated, comforted, or helped the High side was so much clearly gained, coming as it did from the representative of different antecedents. The difference was between a presumably sympathetic antagonist and an untrustworthy and incomprehensible ally. Many years ago, before we had even met the then Archdeacon Wilberforce, Archdeacon Hare was prophesying to us that he would one day become Archbishop of Canterbury. We made some half-interrogatory reply about his being in some way a High Churchman, and were confounded by the assurance of the aversion which he felt to the Oxford school, which naturally coloured our estimate of one who was still to us a personal stranger. It is hard upon his memory now that he should be forced to appear inconsistent and capricious, by having a position posthumously thrust upon him which those who could best judge of him at the time by personal knowledge decisively disclaimed on his behalf, and to which there is no evidence to show that he himself ever laid claim.

We dare, at this time of day, to assert, that whatever was living and not dry in English High Churchmanship, from the time when, in 1832, Hugh James Rose started the *British Magazine*, and in 1833 the Oxford leaders launched the *Tracts for the Times*, was assimilated by or hung on to Tractarianism. It was Tractarian, or semi-Tractarian, or quasi-Tractarian. Here and there a student of an older school, impatient of what seemed to him the presumption or novelties of younger men, such as Bishop Mant or Dr. Maitland (himself a writer in the *British Magazine*), may have done good individual work, or a ruling spirit, such as Bishop Blomfield, with the Bismarckian instinct of governing by being all things to all men, may have alternately patronized and snubbed Tractarianism. But these and such like men had no cohesion, no power of gathering and keeping together a party, or of launching a far-sighted programme. All these qualities were possessed by the Tractarians, including under that name such auxiliary organizations as the Camdenians who flourished at Cambridge under the patronage of Thomas Thorp and Dr. Mill. Seniors, such as Dean Chandler, and, among laymen, J. H. Markland—to leave Bishop Phillpotts in his own place of unique eminence—appreciated the living force of the new phe-

Digitized by Google

nomenon, and generously fostered it. All this time, however, Samuel Wilberforce rightly, logically, and conscientiously, according to our estimate of his views and position, was shy of, frightened at, and averse from Tractarianism, both as a system and as personified by its leaders. He rejected the stone, and he was slow to appreciate that it was growing into a mountain.

Our evidence, which we shall proceed to give in a more systematic form, is all found within the boards of Canon Ashwell's own volume, issued and published by himself. The divine who, according to his estimate, 'was a Churchman and a High Churchman from the first' says, in 1834, of the Church Missionary Society, 'It is my favourite Society, so thoroughly Church of England, so active and spiritual' (p. 68). In the same year, while enthusiastic in intellectual admiration of Mr. Newman's *Arians*, he thinks (among other disparaging remarks) 'its remarks on preaching likely to be *very* (*sic*) injurious.' There is 'a dangerous spirit visible;' and 'something of harshness,' 'and a lowering view of doctrine, connected with, and hence justified by, high poetical feelings and holy habits, all of which I think make it very dangerous' (p. 69). On the other hand, he found in Mr. Newman's conversation in 1836 'Scripture, Christian antiquity deeply studied and thoroughly imbibed, humility, veneration, love of truth, and the highest glow of poetical feelings' (p. 95). In 1836 the view of baptism given in the *Tracts* 'seems to me pushed too far' (p. 97). In 1837 the difficulties in which he is beginning to find that his position as a Low Churchman with higher instincts is landing him oppress the Rector of Brighstone; for, speaking to himself in his private journal of his own bishop, relative, and patron, Bishop Sumner of Winchester, he writes, 'I am in a false position with him. I do *not* hold what he *rightly* dislikes in Pusey and Newman, &c., and I hardly know how to disavow *this*, without seeming also to disavow what I *do* hold, being more High Church in *feeling* than he is' (p. 111). Those who remember the career of that Bishop, who, kind-hearted as he was, felt it a matter of conscience not to make Keble so much as an honorary canon, will appreciate how far this statement goes. In the beginning of 1838 Wilberforce takes the trouble of explaining at some length, in a letter to Dr. Hook (p. 115), how he differs from the Tractarians, the drift of the whole being much admiration of the aim and of various details of the system, but a clear repudiation of anything like party adhesion. At length the Memoirs of R. H. Froude were published, for whom individually Wilberforce had a deep affection, and of whose 'mighty

Digitized by Google

Strange to say, Canon Ashwell seems to see no more in this than 'Samuel Wilberforce's thorough antipathy of whatever savoured of party spirit.' Surely the Archdeacon's conduct in the following autumn at the election of Poetry Professor was openly and incontestably that of a party man.

The unhappy Jerusalem Bishopric then came on the scene, and on February 2, 1842, he tells his brother Robert that he 'cannot make out' Dr. Hook, although agreeing with him on this particular question. We shall only add one more item to an unpleasant recapitulation: the vote to which we have already referred, in favour, not only of the condemnation of Mr. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*, but of its author's degradation.

All these quotations and incidents are, as must be borne in mind, not culled from the Bishop's autograph correspondence or his journals of the time, but merely taken from extracts incorporated into a book of which the avowed scope is to establish a position at variance with the one which we venture to present. All that Mr. Wilberforce may possibly and probably have written and said upon the matter during those eleven years over which our examination ranges, during which also Peace were a living object of interest and excitement, can never of course be ascertained. The examples which we can use from the table-talk of that date, which has [illegible] perished, but from Canon Ashwell's selected letters and records suffice to establish that Samuel Wilberforce, so [illegible] a factor, however independent, in the Tractarian movement, was really, while appreciating and honouring some of its accidents, fundamentally its declared and consistent opponent.

[illegible] the materials placed at our disposal, and [illegible] personal opportunities of studying the Bishop's character at a later date, we should construct the [illegible] Wilberforce of those days as a man on the one side [illegible] on the other unconstrainedly genial and [illegible] and eloquent, with a nature prone to [illegible] and admire the good points of every system, yet [illegible] with what we will call the prepossessions. [illegible] the prejudices, of that 'particular' [illegible] and the conservatism of associations [illegible] powers with him, though often in [illegible] receptivity—would in his eyes [illegible] attributes.

[illegible] phase of early Evangelicalism [illegible] conceptions of a Church superior

Digitized by Google

Strange to say, Canon Ashwell seems to see no more in this than 'Samuel Wilberforce's thorough antipathy of whatever savoured of party spirit.' Surely the Archdeacon's conduct in the following autumn at the election of Poetry Professor was openly and incontestably that of a party man.

The unhappy Jerusalem Bishopric then came on the scene, and on February 2, 1842, he tells his brother Robert that he 'cannot make out' Dr. Hook, although agreeing with him on this particular question. We shall only add one more item to an unpleasant recapitulation: the vote to which we have already referred, in favour, not only of the condemnation of Mr. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*, but of its author's degradation.

All these quotations and incidents are, as must be borne in mind, not culled from the Bishop's autograph correspondence or his journals of the time, but merely taken from extracts incorporated into a book of which the avowed scope is to establish a position at variance with the one which we venture to present. All that Mr. Wilberforce may possibly and probably have written and said upon the matter during those eleven years over which our examination ranges, during which the *Tracts* were a living object of interest and excitement, can never of course be ascertained. The examples which we cull, not from the table-talk of that date, which has unhappily perished, but from Canon Ashwell's selected letters and journals, suffice to establish that Samuel Wilberforce, so far from being a factor, however independent, in the Tractarian movement, was really, while appreciating and honouring some of its accidents, fundamentally its declared and consistent opponent.

Judging by the materials placed at our disposal, and testing them by personal opportunities of studying the Bishop's character at a later date, we should construct the Samuel Wilberforce of those days as a man on the one side deeply pious, and on the other unconstrainedly genial and affectionate, cultured and eloquent, with a nature prone to appreciate and absorb the good points of every system, yet thickly grown round with what we will call the prepossessions, when we might have said the prejudices, of that 'particular' one which filial affection and the conservatism of associations —both very strong motive powers with him, though often in strange conflict with his ready receptivity—would in his eyes invest with doubly sacred attributes.

His system was that better phase of early Evangelicalism which recognized certain conceptions of a Church superior

Digitized by Google

in some practical respects to those entertained by men who held higher dogmatic views in dryness of spirit, and also qualified in the particular case of the Wilberforce family by the grasp which William Wilberforce retained of Baptismal Regeneration as well as his repudiation of Puritanism on the question of Sunday observance. To this his son added as his own contribution an isolated but strong belief in episcopacy.

Project such a man into the vortex of early Tractarian Oxford, and especially into the fascinating society of Oriel, surround him at the University with friends and much beloved relations devoted to the new departure, while those who in the world outside of the University were the principal friends and patrons of so brilliant a young man, and one so well worth contending for, were not only the pronounced leaders of the older opinions which claimed his ancestral allegiance, but something like the persecutors of the rising school in that mild way in which the nineteenth century persecutes:—heap up, we say, these characteristics and these circumstances upon a man of irrepressible energy, life, and ambition, and we create one who must have spoken and acted just as Samuel Wilberforce did. The then Bishops as a body may have misunderstood and mismanaged the Tractarian movement, but certainly the chief blame did not lie with such as Phillpotts, or Bagot, or Monk, or Denison, or, despite a caution which was too often timidity, Howley, or, in his better moods, Blomfield, but with such as Sumner of Winchester and Sumner of Chester. Yet the Sumners were the relatives and the intimates, and one of them, up to the comparative late day when Sir Robert Peel recommended the Archdeacon for the Deanery of Westminster, the exclusive patron and the diocesan of Wilberforce, who owed to him successively rectory, archdeaconry, stall, and better rectory.

Bishop Wilberforce as a High Church leader has become an historical fact which is real, important, and much to be remembered; but his having grown into that leadership is no more a proof of what his views as parson and archdeacon were than the present ecclesiastical conclusions of the two English Cardinals or the political declarations of Mr. Gladstone would be of the opinions on Church and State at that time held by those eminent persons. That which hides the change in one case, and gives prominence to it in another, is the absence or the presence of some visible ceremonial. A pervert has to be 'received;' the transfer of political allegiance involves crossing the floor of the House; while the change of the theological views without change of visible

Digitized by Google

communion may be so gradual that neither the man himself nor his friends can exactly say when it began and when it ended. We shall see further on with what caution the Bishop of Ely speaks of the growth of the Bishop of Oxford's views even after the great change had been substantially made.

It may be urged that during all this period Wilberforce was intrinsically more of a High Churchman than he himself was aware of. Without contradicting an assertion in which we admit an element of truth, we must qualify it by that which is only an apparent inconsistency, that he was at the same time less of a High Churchman than he had persuaded himself into thinking that he was, and as he imagined that he ought to be rated by his High Church friends. What we mean is that he had had so little time, and was so little qualified through the possession of a hard unimaginative logical temperament, to think out and test the fundamentals of Tractarianism, that he actually imagined its leaders were shaking off and wronging him only because they were jogging along the road on which he had impatiently sought their company without having previously consulted the finger-posts. On the other hand, and in proof of his being really higher than he knew, his own nature, superior as it was to the system in which it had been trained, was unconsciously assimilating fragments of the reprobated system. The process was unconscious, and so, when suddenly brought to realize how much he had assimilated, and how much not, as by the publication of Froude's 'Remains,' or Williams on 'Reserve,' the surprise and indignation which he showed seemed inexplicable in a man to whom outsiders had attributed a more acute consciousness of the thoughts of men with whom he habitually consorted. The extreme bitterness so consistently felt and often expressed by Low Churchmen at a subsequent period about that leading man in the other camp, who was certainly always the most ready to turn a sympathetic side to them, is mainly to be accounted for, not only from their never forgetting to regard him as a deserter, but by their additional appreciation of the sort of man whom they had lost: one who had, as they feared, seen through and through them, who had gone off with his mental pigeon-holes crammed with memoranda of all their foibles and inconsistencies, and who would find it as easy and pleasant to laugh them down as to put them down in any more solemn way. Other men of learning and weight had likewise gone over to the higher side, but they were not commanders of light artillery, and their former party could therefore stand their desertion with

Digitized by Google

that kind of equanimity with which Tories now endure the personal loss of Lord Derby, while to the Evangelicals the defection of Samuel Wilberforce was as that of the late Lord Derby to the Liberals of his time.

Keeping in mind the cautions which we have offered, readers may turn with great profit to Canon Ashwell's most accurate, laborious, ample, and candid narrative of the early life and early personality of the man who rose to be Bishop of Oxford and Winchester. The restricting exigencies of space compel us to decline the pleasant task of becoming their guides, though we should gladly linger over many most interesting details of a personal kind, the characteristic letters of William Wilberforce for instance, and the early schooling of the future prelate. We can but in passing refer to an episode which surely was prophetic of the Bishop of Oxford's courageous and successful achievement in taking up and carrying out the revival of Convocation. This achievement, carried through under the heavy irresistible importunity of the layman who never would take a 'no,' or understand a rebuff, was obviously prefigured in the boy Samuel Wilberforce having been at his private school beaten at an examination, and then thrashed in the body, and thus inspired with a spirit of emulation which proved lifelong, by his sturdy schoolfellow Henry Hoare. We must even avert our eyes from the glimpses of that sweet family life of Brighstone of which just the corner of the veil is raised, for we have in a short space to deal with many characteristics of the public life of the late Bishop of Winchester.

Imperceptibly do we find ourselves led on to our second, more interesting and more important, topic, Wilberforce, Bishop and High Churchman. At this turning-point of his career, Canon Ashwell's documents fail us; and, although there may be enough in print spread through many books, pamphlets, and newspapers, to enable the historian to continue the narrative step by step, it is one beyond the scope of a reviewer. It is enough to say that, in the change, the Bishop's pure nobleness of character conspicuously displayed itself, as it was mainly brought about by two events; the first of which would naturally have tempted a lesser man into disappointed and sullen apathy, and the second driven him (considering his keen antipathy to Rome, and his peculiarly strong family affections) into sour intolerant Puritanism. These were the Hampden fiasco, and the secession of so many nearest and dearest to him. Canon Ashwell was, we make little doubt, right in pointing out how the growth of scepticism (of which *Essays and Reviews* were the evidence) was a strong

Digitized by Google

impulse with Wilberforce in the right direction. All danger, he then learned, was not on the side of Rome. If we were called upon to find some definite period from which we might date the new departure, we should say that the later Wilberforce first came conspicuously before the public when, in the disgraceful days of the Papal Aggression scare, he alone of men in a high station, feeling himself called on to make a formal protest, did so as a Churchman against that which was an ecclesiastical, but not a political, wrong to England.

In connexion with this came, at the end of 1850, Lord John Russell's scandalous Durham Letter and the consequent outburst, which he had by his insinuations so maliciously fomented, against Prayer-Book worship. True to his newer and higher instincts, the Bishop of Oxford had the courage, in a letter which appeared in the *Guardian* of March 29, 1851, addressed to one of his clergy who had been delated to him for Tractarianism, to say :—

'There is need just now of great forbearance between clergy and people. Some of us, alas! have forsaken the truth, and gone over to the corruptions of Rome; and this, of course, makes all who seem in anything to agree with those who have gone suspected. But these suspicions are unjust. Our people should lay them aside, and we should be patient. Among the best and greatest men in the Church of England, many have been what are now called High Churchmen. Such were the martyr Bishop Ridley, Bishop Andrewes, Richard Hooker, whom all times since have called 'the judicious.' But for the labours and sufferings of such men, and God's blessing on their labours, we should not now have the Church of England; for Puritanism would, as it did for a time, have subverted it, and with it the crown of our monarchs, our civil liberties, and, above all, our hereditary faith. And if now all those who believe, and labour, and pray, as Hooker did, are to be cast out of the Church, the Church of England will not long survive their expulsion, and then must come—first the war of all sects, and then the end of all religion. May God, then, of His mercy for Christ's sake, give us a spirit of love and peace, one to the other, of mutual forbearance and kindness, that through his great grace we may maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.'

It was an unhappy falling-off from the tone of this letter, not less than from the protest in the Sheldonian Theatre, when immediately after its publication the Bishop of Oxford joined the two Archbishops (Sumner and Musgrave) and twenty-one of his brother suffragans in an Address to the clergy, which under the thin disguise of some vacillating and inconsistent advice was cleverly intended by those among its signers who really understood to what they were putting

Digitized by Google

their hands to snub as unpopular and inconvenient the rapidly growing attention to decencies of worship. We have ground for believing that Bishop Wilberforce joined in the issue of this paper to prevent its being worse; but it would have been far better both for the good of the Church, and for his own growing influence, if the paper had been worse and the name of Wilberforce absent from it. That this address issued at a moment of popular frenzy, such as this late generation with all there may be to trouble it has never experienced, should have fallen a *brutum fulmen*, was presumably due in the first instance to the unaided action of a single man, one of the four Bishops who would not sign it, Phillpotts of Exeter. Phillpotts made the 'Address of Twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops' one of the sections of his anxiously expected Pastoral of April 9, 1851, which appeared within a very few days of the unlucky document. He asks:

'Is it not rather true that differences on incomparably higher matters, grave questions of doctrine, are those which really interfere with the unity and peace of the Church? Is it then accordant with the true dignity, or even very manifestly consistent with the first duty, of Bishops, to close their eyes, and seal their mouths, against the daring violation of an article of the Creed, and to look at nothing but little ritual irregularities?

'These matters cannot be dealt with justly or effectively without looking at the specialties of every particular one. . . . In view of the attack on the doctrine of Baptism I deemed it little short of mockery to put forth an united address to our clergy, praying them to submit to us, as doubts, these small matters, many of which do not seem to them to be doubtful at all.'

As to the ritual question itself on which the Address dwells, Bishop Phillpotts' conclusion is—

'But where no prohibition, expressed or implied, and no reason drawn from the particular office, or from the general tone and nature of our Liturgy, is opposed to the introduction of a Catholic usage practised before Edward VI.'s reign, I am not prepared to say that such a thing is always improper, much less merits the reprobation of the whole Episcopal body.'

The Bishop of Exeter's summing up of what he considered the duty of the Bishops at that time to have been is that—

'for these reasons, and for others which it is not necessary to state, I ventured to urge my brethren to relinquish the proposed letter to the clergy—a measure which seemed to me manifestly nugatory, and which professes to be excused only by the commonplace phrase "under present circumstances"—and, instead of it, I advised that, as honest Churchmen and faithful bishops, we should go to the foot of the throne, and there dutifully lay before Her Majesty a plain statement

Digitized by Google

of what those "present circumstances" are—the country agitated from one extremity to another by religious differences—all confidence in the rulers of the Church shaken—individual clergymen and laymen flying from the Communion of such a Church, by reason of the paralysis under which it seems to them to be dragging on a worthless and faithless existence; a widely-spread suspicion that many more —some of them, it may be, of our very best, most learned, most attached brethren—will soon follow; above all, I proposed that we should submit to Her Majesty that the only reasonable hope of staying the progress of the contagion is that she will be graciously pleased, in accordance with the practice of the best and wisest of her predecessors, and with the dictates of Constitutional law, to call together the authorities of the Church in Convocation, and empower and require them to deliberate on the existing evils, and devise and submit for Her Majesty's sanction such remedies as to their united wisdom shall seem meet.'

We have dwelt upon this incident because, although it might at first sight appear rather to belong to the biography of Bishop Phillpotts than of Bishop Wilberforce, we believe that it greatly contributed to shaping the subsequent career of the younger prelate. A tonic influence seems to have proceeded from the strong old man, and although many words and deeds of Wilberforce's in later years may have invited criticism, the animating spirit never did. He had by conviction definitively taken his side, and he worked for it as few would or could work. But among the agencies which led up to it, the part taken by Phillpotts ought never to be overlooked; and his relations towards his younger brother on the Bench must be realized by any historian who desires to give the real and not the conventional story of Bishop Wilberforce. Phillpotts firmly determined that he who was a youth in his eyes should be a High Churchman, and the more powerful swayed the more brilliant genius. The Bishop of Oxford has been long and rightly honoured as the Bishop to whose active personal exertions we are more indebted than to those of any other of his brethren for the revival of Convocation, yet we here read, at an earlier date, and at a moment far less propitious than the one which Wilberforce had the tact to seize, the proclamation of the necessity of the step from the Bishop and theologian of a far older generation, which produced a deep effect upon the Church's mind, in nerving it up to the demand. Phillpotts' formulated claim, connected as it was with the revival of his own diocesan synod, made Wilberforce's practical action possible for the revival of the national synod.

In order to attain safe and clear conclusions upon the character and results of Samuel Wilberforce's episcopate, we

Digitized by Google

must reach generals through particulars. It is not enough that we should analyse his influence as the key to his work; but considering, as we shall show further on, that this influence was peculiarly and uniquely personal, we may profitably depart from the logical and regular treatment of our subject, and begin with an attempt to put the veritable man as he spoke and as he looked before those of our readers to whom he may, unhappily for themselves, be but a name.

Bishop Wilberforce's oratory has alternately been depreciated and overpraised. Those who have depreciated it are unjust to an exquisite humour and never-failing undercurrent of irony; while his adulators slur over the undeniable fact that he was occasionally apt to be turgid and mouthy. We should give a good deal to be certified whether the Bishop had at any period of his life been a playgoer. Offhand it might be said that such an idea was very unlikely; but it becomes less improbable when we read of William Wilberforce's sensible views about keeping Sunday, so unexpectedly brought out by his son in defending himself against some detractors who thought they had got the Bishop of Oxford on the hip when they could blazon forth that he sat by while Prince Albert was playing chess on Sunday evening. His merits and his defects are reciprocally compatible with the hypothesis of his having or not having been a playgoer, while, of course, if the negative view be the true one, the intellectual success of one who was in the highest sense a *histrio* of the first order was much the greater, and his rhetorical shortcomings so much the more excusable.

We shall make ourselves most intelligible by recalling the circumstances under which Bishop Wilberforce preached the two sermons which made the most vivid impression upon ourselves, and that one which struck us as the most conspicuous failure of his to which we had ever listened. They were all preached while he was Bishop of Oxford. The occasion of the first was commonplace enough: a charity sermon good-naturedly granted for the schools of a district church in a northern suburb of London. The church was Christ Church, Hoxton; and the clergyman to whom Bishop Wilberforce was showing this kindness was William Scott. The church was of course full, the congregation being emphatically of the less opulent middle class, clerks and so forth. The sermon was obviously an old one, and its subject was the lesson of the seven devils entering into the man. It was a good sermon, but by no means one of Wilberforce's most brilliant compositions. To put the matter plainly, it was

Digitized by Google

falling very flat, and the preacher noticed that such was the case. The climax of collapse seemed imminent. He had reached a passage of his discourse in which he portrayed the unhappy condition of a young man tormented by the devil of sensuality. At this point the Bishop stopped, and took a rapid glance at the half-indifferent throng who filled the church, made up of prosperous tradesmen, with their virtuous wives and daughters, and young clerks, some of whom possibly believed that an industriously posted ledger entitled them to an evening spent according to their own devices. Then he shut his sermon book, and burst into an extempore sentence, the sound of which, after so many years, is still ringing in our ears—delivered with his slowest intonation and most staccato impressiveness—'and then sometimes a worse thing than that happens to that unhappy young man: the devil of sensuality leaves him, to be replaced by the sevenfold worse devil of *respectability*.' Never was a sermon better listened to than the remainder of this discourse.

The incident which we have just endeavoured to place before our readers marks a specimen of courageous ready genius which converts failure into success. The sermon to which we shall now advert was preached, under very different circumstances, in a little village church and to a handful of auditors, but that village church was Addington, and among the handful were an Archbishop, Longley, and a Queen, Emma of Hawaii. The congregation was appreciative, the building so small as to give free play to the most delicate inflexions of voice and to bring into view the most versatile changes of countenance. The occasion was altogether inspiriting, and the sermon took the form of a supposed dialogue between God and the human soul, beautifully and subtilely conceived, and acted with both the highest and finest dramatic powers.

Once, on the other hand, we heard the Bishop of Oxford make what was clearly a great venture under exceptional circumstances, and yet undoubtedly fail. The date was October 1868, the scene S. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. The hour was the evening, and the subject matter a sermon for the Propagation of the Gospel Society. It was during the Dublin Church Congress, with the shades of disestablishment gathering, and from that pulpit two or three days before had sounded that memorable discourse with which the then Dean of Cork, in a very brief time to be named Bishop of Peterborough, had opened the proceedings of the gathering. Somehow the Bishop did not seem to 'orient' himself comfortably. The cathedral is large and at night very dark, and

Digitized by Google

was as strange to the Bishop as the nationality of the main portion of the congregation, while the pulpit is so placed as to give the preacher no command of the audience; so the result was, what would have been a good sermon from any other mouth, but from his a disappointment. The occasion was great, and Wilberforce felt it to be so, but he missed his leverage. The magnetic attraction was put out, but its master did not realize what was metal and what lacquer. At Addington, on the contrary, the weight and quality of all the human units collected round him had been accurately gauged and inventoried. Hence the success there and the failure at Dublin, where he neither knew people nor place, and felt that few could see him in the dim artificial light of that even-song. The dulcet voice sounded as sonorous and sweet as ever. But the preacher for his own comfort needed to be assured of some reciprocity of sympathy. At Hoxton, among that wilderness of strangers to whom he was discoursing, he was sure of one or two sympathetic and leading spirits, and he was bold accordingly. In Dublin he was a stranger, and the impetus was not forthcoming. The same contrast may be drawn from the history of that meeting at Bradford at which, almost a Yorkshireman himself, he was able to quell the brawling opposition of Yorkshire shouters, compared with the discomfiture which he endured at the working men's meeting during the Liverpool Congress, when he found himself brought face to face with a packed meeting of Orange roughs. Fearless as he was, he seemed always to crave for some one to be standing by him, not so much for succour as for sympathy.

There can be no doubt that Bishop Wilberforce's most conspicuous defect as an orator was the temptation which beset him to abuse his richly sonorous and flexible voice by mouthing his words. He probably fell into the habit from the desire of throwing his voice as far as possible. We remember a rather amusing example of this exaggeration of manner which bordered upon a somewhat comic effect. It occurred in a discourse preached at the opening of Ardingly School in its temporary chapel. The preacher aptly drew the parable from the miracle of the poisonous gourds in the pottage converted into wholesome and nourishing food by Elisha. But unhappily the often repeated text was 'There is death in the pot,' and the effect of that most homely English monosyllable 'pot,' constantly projected by Bishop Wilberforce in his grandest and most protracted accent, was somewhat of a trial to persons with a keen sense of what we will term the incongruous. It was as marked as it was odd that the Bishop

Digitized by Google

himself, in whom perception of humour was generally so strongly developed, seemed on this occasion quite unconscious of the incident.

To say the truth, we have often felt a secret sympathy for that luckless knot of children who suddenly felt the angry glare of a whole congregation focussed on their devoted selves, as from the pulpit proceeded the awful commentary, 'I said let us p-r-a-y, not let us l-a-u-g-h.' We are sure that some humorous twinkle, some mirth-inviting intonation, some transient revelation of the thought which was inwardly moving the versatile mind, must, unconsciously to the great orator, have passed over his face, which, in spite of the time and place, was too much for the ingenuous minds of innocent youth.

Plainly to put the case, Bishop Wilberforce's countenance was so flexible that we fancy he did not himself always know what it was expressing. So, thoroughly to appreciate Samuel Wilberforce as an orator, mere familiarity with his words is quite insufficient. It requires the student to have been thoroughly familiar with his marvellous physiognomy, in which pathos and humour seemed always to be strongly contending for the mastery, and frequently dividing the simultaneous expression. He must take in the colourless complexion; the cheeks in his later years too puffy; the flexible, unheroic, but most expressive nose; the fine brow; the sparkling, rapidly moving eyes; and the mouth presenting in its amplitude an unparalleled organ for an unique voice.

We feel something like resentment when we think how many persons in coming times may draw their ideas of what Samuel Wilberforce was like from Mr. Richmond's drawing of him in his earlier days which forms the frontispiece of this first volume. Excellent as Mr. Richmond is in catching a likeness, he cannot, of course, catch one when it is not there to be caught. It is abundantly clear that the zealous young Archdeacon, when he took himself to the artist's studio, was labouring under an access of conventional propriety, and assumed accordingly a very engaging aspect of archidiaconal seriousness. The result is, a certainly handsome young man, whose mien betokens goodness, and his coat some ecclesiastical rank, not less than that of an archdeacon, but in whom nothing but the facial line is anything like a presentment of Samuel Wilberforce such as he now stands before us, with all the infinite and lovable variety of his versatile countenance.

So much for Bishop Wilberforce's outward presentment. Having noticed him in his external aspect, we can proceed to inquire what was the special secret of his influence and of

Digitized by Google

his success. We must begin by answering this question with a string of negatives. It was not his erudition, which was more varied than profound; it was not his strategy, which, however active and incessant, occasionally failed by being buoyant and transparent when it ought to have been wary and silent; it was not his knowledge of character, which was occasionally strangely at fault from too guileless a belief in the good intentions of others, and from an ear too easily open to the accents of lip agreement; it was only in part his indefatigable zeal in organizing. The Open Sesame which he was privileged to utter could not be lent or parted with; it was an unique gift, to describe which we shall coin a phrase and term it moral magnetism; it was a sympathy which not only drove him to open himself to the person with whom he was in communication, but which drew that person to the Bishop's side, and made him or her, in spite of self, co-operator in whatever Wilberforce pleased to set his conquered thrall upon.

A gift so peculiar as this was had, of course, its dangers. With all his good intentions of performing every kind thing which he was continually promising to each and every applicant, time is limited and memory fallible; and he sometimes gave his detractors the opportunity of persecuting him with the false charge of insincerity. In fact, he was too sincere. He spoke as he thought at the moment, while a more wary man would not have been so prodigal of good-nature. Yet, granting all this, Samuel Wilberforce's 'gush,' his honied voice, his attractive smile, his vigorous hand-shaking, were essential and important elements of his success. His ordinations and his confirmations were in their effects on the lives and consciences of the neophytes as those of no other bishop, and the reason of their superiority was the intensity of sympathy which he was able to put into actions which, in the hands of a good and kind but dry man, may be no more than necessary *opera operata.*

No doubt also the consciousness that he possessed this moral magnetism was in some degree a snare to the Bishop in working out his schemes for the future administration of the Church. For example, as long as he lived, he opposed the division of the See of Winchester, and was altogether cold about more bishops. He was forgetful it may be that threescore years and ten were close upon him, and that no man could bear the burden of the oppressive variety of such an administration. He was impatient at the suggestion that every Bishop of Winchester could not be ex-

Digitized by Google

pected to be a Wilberforce. Neither can it be denied that his little zeal for an increased Episcopate was partly due to the fact that he carried to an excess the wholesome jealousy of too much cheapening an English Bishop's status. In details also he was perhaps a little too anxious to make people happy without sufficient thought of ulterior consequences, as in the Acts of Parliament, which have wiped out so much Church history in the arbitrary conversion of Perpetual Curates into Vicars, or even Rectors—'Rectors' themselves sometimes the nominees of 'Vicars.'

We are spared the difficult task of analysing the opinions of the Bishop of Oxford in the position which he so heartily took up, and to which he so steadfastly adhered for the remainder of his life, of a convinced High Churchman, by the masterly sketch presented in the Bishop of Ely's most interesting letter, describing the ordinations at Cuddesdon, in which, as examining chaplain, he took a prominent part for sixteen years:—

'The conduct of a theological examination, continued through many years, necessarily brings out to the view of those associated with him the inner mind of the examiner, and the gradual modifications, if any, of his opinions. Bishop Wilberforce's theology, like his character, was many-sided. It had affinities with all the great parties comprehended within the Church. Upon the doctrines of Justification and Sanctification, he was in harmony with the Evangelical School rather than with Bishop Bull; in regard to the Sacramental system, he was in accord with Andrewes, Ken, Brevint; whilst the intense activity of his own mind gave the speculations of the Broad Church party an interest in his eyes, which, joined to the affectionateness of his nature, held him in the bond of sincere friendship with some of its leaders. From this character of his theology, it followed as a necessary consequence that he should be exposed to the charge of inconsistency from all sides; the fact being that, when to one school he appeared to be compromising a truth, he really so spoke and taught respecting it because upon that special point he was in accord with the opposite school.

'My own observation does not witness to any marked change of doctrinal opinion during the years in which I was associated with Bishop Wilberforce, although the varying controversies of the day may have given more definite shape to what he had all along held. Thus the doctrine of there being in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a commemorative sacrifice, wherein the Church on earth pleads before the Father the atoning death of the Son, imitating in a divinely appointed way our Lord's own intercession above—this doctrine of late assumed, I should say, a greater prominence to his mind. So, again, the identity of the public and private absolution as to potential effect became, perhaps, a more important tenet with him, as

Digitized by Google

he thought he saw a growing disposition to make private confession compulsory. Accordingly, he of late was careful to have inserted in the examination papers a question which should draw forth a recognition of the sameness of power and effect in the three forms of absolution provided in the Prayer-Book. Similarly, the controversy as to the authority of Holy Scripture (whilst he most certainly rejected the theory of verbal inspiration) rendered him increasingly careful in testing the candidates as to their knowledge of the radical difference between the two propositions—"The Bible *contains* the word of God," and "the Bible *is* the word of God"—and in urging the latter as the only adequate definition.'

The passing reference to the Bishop's views upon Justification is explained and illustrated by a letter to his brother Robert of the date of 1838, which is too long to reproduce, but which will be found on page 121 of the Memoir. So in 1839 Mr. Newman is declared to be 'too little evangelic;' while in 1845, though Dr. Pusey is 'a very holy man,' at whose feet the then lately consecrated Bishop 'would sit,' yet 'I see that he is, if I understand God's Word aright, most dark as to many parts of Christ's blessed gospel.' It is clear, we think, from the Bishop of Ely's explanation, that he would not have thus expressed himself in later years; while from Bishop Woodford's tone it is equally clear that Bishop Wilberforce had never quite reached his chaplain's own eminently moderate conception of orthodox Anglican doctrine. He always refused to have Bishop Bull recommended to his candidates.

How far misleading even to himself Canon Ashwell's conceptions of the Bishop's opinions during the earlier period were, can best be seen by referring to some words contained in the Introduction, which we have no hesitation in declaring to be the most beguiling and the least accurate of all the statements in the book. We refer to the passage wherein the writer, discussing the Bishop's memorable episcopate, talks of 'the way in which he converted the High Church movement from being a mere school of opinion, as its tendency was when he came to his See, to become the most powerful of active agents in practical duty.' No one can exaggerate the Bishop of Oxford's power in promoting the practical activity of the Church movement, and in preventing its degenerating, after the fervour of its first activity had been spent, into a mere school of opinion, who stops short of claiming for him a monopoly. But in the name of the brave good men who had been toiling along the paths of practical activity as standard-bearers of the High Church party, while the Rector of Brighstone and the Archdeacon of Surrey was still following out

Digitized by Google

the illusory dream of an eclectic Low Churchmanship with a High Church varnish—to which, with all his energy and popularity, he was unable to rally half a dozen or perhaps even two genuine recruits—we protest against that one assumption as no less cruel to him than to those whom it directly hits. Of course the results of practical activity after 1845 were more successful and on a larger scale than before that date, because, by the law which governs the next to earliest stage of all revivals, with the adolescence of every great movement labour and anxiety are apt to be at the maximum, while visible results may still be tentative and undeveloped. The workers toil that others may enter into their labours, and with comparative ease reap what they have sown. Were the *Oxford Tracts*, the *Library of the Fathers*, and the *Anglo-Catholic Library;* were the *British Magazine*, the *British Critic*, and the *Christian Remembrancer*, mere manifestoes of a school of opinion? Was there nothing more practical for the soul than opinion in the sermons of Newman, Pusey, Hook, Marriott? Was Lord John Manners's first experiment of a sisterhood in Albany Street only a display of opinion? Were the gigantic strides which church building and church restoration took only the exuberances of some school of opinion? Were those active worshippers at early services, and the then novel phenomena of frequent communions, who thronged Christ Church in Albany Street, Margaret Chapel, Holy Trinity at Brompton, S. Paul's at Knightsbridge, Christ Church at Hoxton, merely the votaries of opinion as contrasted with practice? When Nathaniel Woodard planned his schools and Edward Coleridge his Missionary College, were these men merely revelling in a sterile enjoyment of opinion? Did opinion only prompt the National Society to make its great plunge, and at S. Mark's to undertake the true training of the trainer? Did Glenalmond, S. Columba's, Radley and Bradfield, merely mean opinion? When S. Peter's, and in a few years S. Saviour's, Leeds, were consecrated, did opinion reign or practice? When Selwyn embarked for New Zealand with Whytehead and Abraham to support him, and when the creation of an expansive, broadly conceived Colonial Episcopate was decreed, was the banner then lifted aloft that of scholastic opinion merely, or of opinion fructifying into practice?

We have tested in sorrow and surprise this extraordinary passage, because it gives the key to the fundamental error which has reduced what otherwise would have been a very excellent biography to the level of a very good one; an error which was, we fully believe, unconsciously generated in the

Digitized by Google

author's mind from his having started with an implicit theory, to which he shaped facts, instead of allowing theory to be evolved out of the facts as they revealed themselves to his inquiry.

We cannot travel over the many incidents which sum up Bishop Wilberforce's episcopal career in his triple aspect of diocesan, supplementary Metropolitan—as all felt him to be—and protector of Colonial and American Churches. His share in the revival of Convocation, of which we have already said something, belongs to general history. We may profitably present him in his relations to one question, with which our Communion has been and is, for good or bad, abnormally agitated. His treatment of the worship controversy affords an admirable instance of his large-hearted charity and wise readiness to assimilate existing tendencies. Personally, he cared less for the beauty of holiness in worship in its systematic, or we may say scientific, aspect, than might have been conceived by those who were not in his more intimate confidence, or had closely watched his public utterances. The æsthetic side of his character found its pleasure in the beauties of nature. His Oxford training had so little prepared him for the simple, not to say bald, ceremonial of the evensong at Margaret Chapel during Mr. Oakeley's incumbency, that upon May 6, 1844, he wrote:—

'Went with Fosbery in the evening to Margaret Street Chapel. I shall never go again. It was so odd as to provoke attention to separate details, instead of the true devotional purpose. Oakeley's sermon was poor and barren in the extreme. The singing beautiful; one Old Version Psalm to an old Gregorian tune was quite marvellously beautiful' (p. 237).

In the following year he had an opportunity of showing, in an amusing way, how little he had learned of what bishops have come to call Liturgiology. The Dean of Westminster, as he then was, had to read an opening address at the Winchester meeting of the Archæological Association (now Institute), and he was actually able, in the presence of some who had heard, and perhaps read, something of the rituals of Sarum and York, and recollected S. Gregory the Great's injunctions to S. Austin, from which undoubtedly distinctive English ritual took its rise, to talk of 'a worship which consisted mainly in gazing upon the vicarious decorations of a priestly class' (as to which we have for thirty-five years been puzzling ourselves to attach a meaning to 'vicarious'), and to denounce a 'ceremonial made up in great measure of pompous processions, and litanies wherein external significance was

Digitized by Google

prized more highly than the secret sigh of the broken heart.' From this rhetorical burst a matter-of-fact listener might have inferred that his preference lay in favour of prayers devoid of external significance, or, in other words, dark and unintelligible. In pleasant contrast to these vain words we find, on Canon Ashwell's personal testimony, that the Bishop had learned not only to appreciate but to practise at personal inconvenience that laudable obligation of the Reformed not less than of the Unreformed Church—the perpetual recitation by the clergy of the Daily Offices. In confirmation of this incident we may observe that the Bishop vigorously and successfully resisted attempts to weaken the obligation which were made within the Ritual Commission. In his last years the Bishop was much troubled with the vagaries of the ultra-ritualists, whom, notwithstanding personal predilections, he treated with exemplary tenderness. But in that memorable charge to the candidates for ordination which, as it fell out, was delivered only four days before his death, while giving the neophytes timely warning against excesses and eccentricities alien from the true spirit of the Church of England, instead of picking his examples from fields where there is, we grieve to say, far too much to pick, the Bishop of Winchester launched a conventional indictment, which revealed the slight study he must have bestowed upon the question in its systematic aspects. As a typical instance of abuse, he fell foul of incense, as incompatible with the mind of the Church of England, quite forgetting, not merely that he was condemning the Divine ritual of the Jewish Church, and the natural instinct of all religions except Mohamedanism, but that he was actually casting a slur upon the memories of Andrewes, Laud, Cosin, and Sancroft. Had he said instead that the adoption, in the present state of public feeling, of incense was infinitely unwise, he would have said what was unanswerable and most salutary. But in taking the line which he did he was only giving an easy triumph to the men whom he was striving to restrain.

Yet Bishop Wilberforce, in his latter years, showed himself the generous protector, the fatherly and affectionate champion, not only of ceremonial up to the level of his own improved appreciation, but of many more decided developments. If the secret history of the Ritual Commission could be written, the record of his unceasing exertions in the cause of toleration would surprise Puritans, and win the gratitude of Ritualists. In every successive division for conceding some allowance of vestments his vote was given with the minority. In the framing of that first Report, which

Digitized by Google

after all only 'restrained,' and did not prohibit, there his influence made itself powerfully felt. There were two long debates (each running into a second day) within that argumentative body, of which, perhaps happily, no report exists, upon both of which the Bishop fought a good fight, and on one was victorious, while on the other he was only narrowly defeated. He mainly helped in the discomfiture of a proposal, which seemed at its inception likely to have been accepted, to abolish the black-letter days. No one could say, or did say, that the actual calendar was the best which could have been devised; but in favour of its retention it was urged that, viewing the impossibility of any revision of the list, it was better to keep it as it was than cynically to break our historical connection with the Church of other days and countries by wiping it out. The astonishment of certain members of the Commission, as they gradually discovered that they were being beaten by absolute argument, was curious to behold. On the other occasion the Bishop was not so fortunate. The original draft of the new lectionary, as it proceeded from the Committee which had prepared it, contained lessons from Tobit; and these we believe would have been in the Prayer-Book now, had not, unfortunately, a statesman, to whom for various reasons the whole Commission looked up with great respect, risen, and on grounds of some assumed unpopularity attaching to them, proposed the excision of the selections from Tobit. For two days the battle raged, and at last the innovators won by a narrow majority.

Bishop Wilberforce lost no time in taking advantage of the plain common-sense reading of Lord Cairns's judgment in the early Martin *v.* Mackonochie case, to adopt the eastward position, for which he had a decided predilection. However, on the delivery of the Purchas judgment, he thought himself compelled to return to the north end; but, after a very transitory and perfunctory exhortation to his clergy to do what is called 'obey the law,' he left them free to read the Rubric preceding the Prayer of Consecration either in a natural or a non-natural way. One distinguished clergyman who had set up a reverent presentment of moderate ceremonial in a noble church in Hampshire was much troubled at being sent, in the early days after the judgment, to the north end by his diocesan; so, after enduring the burden of his canonical obedience for several weeks, he took advantage of the proximate visit of some friends of his own and the Bishop's to represent, in language of dry humour, what he expected to endure if they should detect him taking his station at the north end.

Digitized by Google

The answer which he received enabled him, for the too short remainder of his life, to resume his position 'before the table' with a safe conscience.

We may here note that the now so common practice, on the part of the Bishops, of relieving the repulsive grimness of their black and white costume by deferring to the canon, and assuming their doctor's hoods, was, for England at all events, started by the Bishop of Oxford, to whom it was suggested by a lay friend during a chat over Archbishop Longley's fireplace at Addington. We rather think that Bishop Forbes had already assumed his hood in Scotland.

The few friends who were privileged to assist in laying the Bishop's remains to rest in Lavington churchyard, on being previously admitted into the sitting-room within his mansion, into which the coffin had been carried, saw standing at its head a conspicuous crucifix. It is impossible to conceive that those who placed there that sacred effigy should not have been conscious that the act would have been well pleasing to Samuel Wilberforce. Of what a growth in the appreciation of external reverence this was a symbol we need hardly indicate.

The labour which Canon Ashwell has bestowed upon the hundred pages in which he tells the story of the unhappy Hampden affair, so far as the Bishop of Oxford was mixed up with it, is exemplary; in particular the impartiality which he has shown in his selection of documents, whether making for or against Wilberforce, is worthy of the highest praise. The concurrent judgment alike of those to whom Bishop Wilberforce's memory is most precious, and of those who would most richly enjoy the opportunity of detracting from his great fame, is that he sadly mismanaged the business, while his error was one of judgment only, and was prompted by thoroughly disinterested and generous feelings. Agreement upon this conclusion is the best ending for a matter the revival of which was alike inevitable and regrettable. So we do not hold ourselves in any way bound to tread again the weary path of that obsolete inquiry, although we are glad to be enabled to print for the first time Bishop Wilberforce's own apology contained in that 'Letter to a Friend' referred to in pages 504–6 of the Memoir, the publication of which he suspended on the advice of friends, and notably of Sir Robert Peel, whose adverse opinion is contained in a letter given by Canon Ashwell. The copy of the letter from which we were allowed to make our transcript is in the writing of a near relation of the Bishop's, and it bears his autograph signature. We owe it to the kindness of Mr. F. H. Dickinson, who is

Digitized by Google

connected by marriage with the Bishop's family. The only observation which we desire to make upon it is to call attention to the explanation which it gives of one incident in the affair which has evidently puzzled Canon Ashwell and all his previous reviewers; namely, how the Bishop could have revoked his Letters of Request. Canon Ashwell hazards the conjecture that this was done 'before they were accepted.' It now appears that those which had been originally issued were irregular, and therefore void, so that if the suit had gone on, fresh letters would have had to have been signed by the Bishop of Oxford:—

'My dear Friend.—If the question before me were "Shall I answer the attacks of newspapers?" I should not hesitate for one moment as to my course. The best answer to such charges is Silence and a Life. They are best met, like subtleties of the Sophist, by the "Solvitur ambulando." But when a friend like yourself tells me that, "whilst you know all the truth, you find others puzzled," I cannot refuse your request that I would put an explanation of what has passed into writing:—

'You tell me I am blamed—

'I. For twice condemning Dr. Hampden without having read his works.

'II. For having at last changed my side.

'I will explain the ground of both objections.

'I. I voted in 1836 (in 1842 I did not vote) for the declaration of the distrust of the University on these grounds. (*a*) My own reading convinced me that there was so much of over-statement, want of reverence, and obscurity *in the Bampton Lectures* as fully justified the University in pronouncing its distrust of Dr. Hampden as a theological teacher. (*b*) Beyond this, *The Observations on Dissent* appeared to me directly to contravene the Thirty-nine Articles.

'My judgment in both these cases was grounded on my examination of Dr. Hampden's writings. Again, I joined with other Bishops in representing to Lord John Russell the evils which would result from the appointment of Dr. Hampden. This also I did on what I now deem sufficient grounds—namely, the censure of the University and the alarm of the Church. This was intended as a private and friendly representation. Those who made it hoped that it would lead to the institution of such enquiries as would procure an authoritative sentence on the soundness or unsoundness of Dr. Hampden's writings. Had it been so received it might have remained a private representation, and would have preserved the peace of the Church. Received and answered as it was, its privacy and its purpose were alike defeated.

'II. I am blamed for having changed my side.

'My answer is a very short one.

'I have never done so.

'I justify now, as I have ever done, both the censure of the

Digitized by Google

University and the representation of the Bishops. I blame, as I have ever blamed, the selection for the Episcopate of a Divine under censure, and the refusal of full inquiry before a competent tribunal.

'My decision, on which depends the appearance of change of side, was in a different subject matter. I was urged to allow the impugners of Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy to bring the matter to issue in the Court of Arches through the machinery of my court. This I was assured by high authority I could do, *ministerially*, and without expressing any judgment myself on his guilt or innocence. This I consented to do, stating at the time in writing that I did so, pronouncing no opinion thereby on the question of the unorthodoxy of the writings impugned; but merely to obtain a judgment of the Courts thereon. After this I consented to the request of the promoters of the suit to seek, as Bishop of the Diocese, for explanations, assurances, and retractations. In doing this I discovered that *The Observations on Dissent*, BOTH EDITIONS, were *legally* beyond all doubt (under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Bill), and in my judgment morally, also, withdrawn. The case of the *Bampton Lectures* remained. As to them, then, I had now this question before me: *not*, do they justify the expressed suspicion of the University; but will they *alone* warrant me, as Bishop, in sending Dr. Hampden to trial for heresy in the Court of Arches, Dr. Hampden reclaiming against such a trial? This question was the more forced upon me by the fact that, owing to a technical inaccuracy in the former "letters of request," I must execute new "letters," and, in fact, begin the suit *de novo* if it was to be instituted at all. To determine this question, then, I carefully examined two points—

'I. How far in the subject matter of "false doctrine" the act of a Bishop in sending a presbyter to trial in the Court of Arches could be, as it had been represented to me, purely *ministerial*.

'II. How far the *Bampton Lectures*, without the *Observations on Dissent*, and, *as the writer had since explained them*, would warrant the extreme charge.

'On the first point I found that the Judge of the Arches Court would not receive "Letters of Request" accompanied with a statement from the Bishop sending them, that he did not himself consider that there was sufficient ground for a criminal suit. His act, that is to say, could not be *purely ministerial*, but must involve a judgment that there was sufficient ground to support a criminal suit.

'I was therefore driven to the second inquiry: Do the *Bampton Lectures, without the "Observations on Dissent," and with Dr. Hampden's explanations*, afford ground for a criminal trial? To settle this question I studied them again, and with them Dr. Hampden's Explanations given since 1836, which I had not had before. I was not now blind to what I still deem the faults of the *Bampton Lectures;* but I was convinced that they would not, *alone* and *explained*, support a suit. I could not, therefore, for any ulterior end (such as obtaining a public trial, or protesting against Dr. Hampden's consecration) say that they would. I had changed no opinion I had before expressed.

Digitized by Google

But altered circumstances required from me altered action, unless I preferred apparent consistency to substantial justice; unless I would assert to the Arches Court that there *was* legal ground, which I believed there *was not*, for trying Dr. Hampden *criminally*. I *therefore* refused to re-institute the suit; and for other reasons, and to prevent an imputation which (from my knowledge of the person with whom I had to deal) I expected to be thrown out, namely, that I had spoken of receiving concessions which had never been made, I stated in detail, in my letter to Dr. Hampden, the exact facts by which I was led to drop the suit. In doing this I implied no dissatisfaction with the censure of the University, or the representation of the Bishops; for I justified both. I expressed no satisfaction with the appointment of Dr. Hampden or the conduct of the minister. But I stated that I thought there was no longer a *legal* ground for resisting the consecration. I hoped by this detailed statement to promote the peace of the Church, first, by showing that some sentence on Dr. Hampden's writings had been pronounced (namely) by his Diocesan after a close study of them, and after hearing all the allegations of their impugners; secondly, by showing that some satisfaction (all I believed to be attainable) had been won for the Church; and thirdly, by satisfying all that in dropping farther opposition, they only acquiesced in the consecration of a Divine whose Diocesan was satisfied that he could not *legally* be proved guilty. It was for this farther reason—namely, to secure this end—that I stated in detail what seemed to me to have been obtained; and that I added my conviction of the unfairness of "the Extracts" from the Bampton Lectures, from which I am convinced that many have formed an exaggerated estimate of what is objectionable in them.

'One word more, and I have done; for as to the despicable motives which some have imputed to me I will not stoop to notice them. But it has been taken for granted that in all this I acted *alone*. So far from this being the case, that I consulted all my right reverend brethren who were within my reach, and acted with the advice and concurrence of five out of six of those whom I was able to consult. I, as Diocesan, was to lead the way, and they to follow. Accidental circumstances alone prevented the immediate declaration of a concurrence which would have added the greatest weight to my own judgment.

'I am, my dear Friend, very truly yours,

'S. Oxon.'

SHORT NOTICES.

Apostolical Succession in the Church of Sweden. By the Rev. A. Nicholson, LL.D., Incumbent of Christ Church, Leamington. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)

The question of the Swedish Episcopal succession has come lately very much to the front, so much so that the Archbishop of Canter-

Digitized by Google

bury and the Bishop of Winchester, shortly before the close of the last meeting of Convocation, drew the attention of the Bishops of the Southern Province to the subject. So early as 1853 an investigation had been entered into in Rome, at the instance of a Churchman, who was requested to procure information on the question for some Swedish gentlemen of position. The main object was to establish by evidence that Dr. Petrus Magnusson, or Magni, Provost of the House of S. Bridget, in Rome, had actually been consecrated Bishop of Westerös. The result of the inquiry was that a letter from King Gustavus Vasa to Pope Clement VII. was found in the Papal archives (which was published in the *Guardian*), but no evidence of the act of consecration could be produced. It emerged in the course of the inquiry that the whole records of Papal consecrations, involving the position of many Bishops in Italy and elsewhere, were consumed some years after in the conflagration which resulted from the sack of the city by the troops of the Constable of Bourbon. A certificate from the Archivist Marini substantiated the fact that no evidence of the actual consecration of Petrus Magnusson was forthcoming. The next step was to procure the best evidence from historical documents that from him flowed the existing Episcopal succession. The materials for forming a clear judgment on this question fortunately abound. Dr. Nicholson, who had for some years acted as British Chaplain in Gottenburg, was well acquainted with the Swedish language, and enjoyed the confidence and friendship of some of the Bishops and higher dignitaries, has devoted his attention to the subject, and having gone to Sweden last autumn to examine the Registers of Upsala, the Diary of Wadstena, and other documents, has published the result of his inquiries. We shall shortly epitomize them, but we earnestly recommend Churchmen, both here and in America, whither many Swedes have resorted, to procure this libellus and study the question carefully for themselves.

The first evidence is the King's letter to the Pope requesting his Holiness to consecrate Petrus Magni as Bishop of Westerös, Sommar as Bishop of Strengnäss, and Haraldson as Bishop of Skara, besides the Pope's Commissary, Johannes Gothus, as Archbishop of Upsala. The latter could not at the time be consecrated in consequence of the exile of Archbishop Troell, who was banished as a traitor, and refused to resign his see. The consecration of the others was delayed by the Pope for no assignable reason, but they received their Orders at a subsequent period from Petrus Magni by desire of the King. What then is the historical proof that Petrus Magni ever acted as Bishop in virtue of his consecration? Wardenberg was Papal prothonotary and Apostolic Secretary in 1524, and Commissary at Rome for the Diocese of Trondhjem, in Norway. In the course of his duty he despatched from Rome an official communication to the Norwegian Primate, Archbishop Olavus Engelbrechtsen, in which he says, *inter alia*:—

'Præterea de mense Martii expedivi ecclesiam Arosiensem in Swetia, pro nostro religioso patre et domino Petro Magni . . . qui etiam consecratus fuit in episcopum Arosiensem Dominica ante ascensionis

Digitized by Google

Domini, et hoc ad scripta regis Swetiæ et capitoli Arosiensis, quod dictum Dominum Petrum absentem in Episcopum postulavit, qui vii. Maii ab urbe in Swetiam descendit,' &c.

The *Diarium Wadzstenense*, which is preserved in the University Library of Upsala, and is reckoned one of its choicest treasures, mentions that Petrus Magni and another were despatched in 1506 to Rome for the purpose of recovering the House of S. Bridget, and the entry of 1524 states, 'that on the day following the separation of the Apostles came our brother Doctor Peter Magnusson from Rome, after having been consecrated "as Bishop of Westerös,"' &c. The contemporaneous and historical evidence of the consecration is very strong, and reference is made to Peter Svart, Confessor to Gustavus Vasa, whose express statement is confirmed in the following century by Tegel, by Rhryzelius, Theiner, and the other writers who are quoted by Dr. Nicholson.

On his arrival in Sweden Petrus was acknowledged by the Pope's Legate, who then administered Upsala, and by others who were champions of the Papacy in the troublous times which soon arose owing to the ingress of Lutheranism. He consecrated three Bishops in 1528, and the circumstances were singular, as he was compelled by the King to consecrate them without waiting for the Papal mandate. All this is certified by contemporaneous historians. The immediate cause for the action of the King was his desire that they should officiate at his marriage and coronation, and he threatened to nominate others in their place if they scrupled to act.

The King was anxious that the marriage ceremony should be performed by the Archbishop of Upsala, and accordingly Laurentius Peterson was consecrated for that See by Petrus Magnusson with the full ritual of the Roman Church, including the use of chrism, which the King insisted on. Three additional Bishops had been previously consecrated by the same prelate. When Gustavus adopted Lutheran opinions the Bishops were placed in a very difficult position, and a remarkable protest was written by Petrus Magni, and by Sommar of Strengnäss, who declared their irreconcilable hostility to the new opinions, and protested that they were compelled and forced to consecrate the above-named Bishops, 'which they exceedingly deplored.'

After his death an epitaph or epitomized biography of his life was written, which is given by Dr. Nicholson. Four of the lines are as follows :—

> 'Per me sacratus non paucus episcopus extat,
> Quorum nonnulli deseruere fidem:
> Inde Lutheranis procrevit clerus in orbe
> Suecorum; mentem sauciat idque meam.'

Laurentius Peterson, the above-named Primate, died in 1573, but before his death he stereotyped the Church procedure as to Episcopal consecrations in the 'Church Ordinance' of 1571, which regulates the existing practice.

We must refer our readers to the exhaustive treatise of Dr.

Digitized by Google

Nicholson for the history of the consecrations after Petrus Magnusson's death. The evidence of the catholicity of the succession is very strong. It is to be regretted that the consecrations were carried on by single Bishops, which it appears might have been avoided. The Anglican Church is probably the one which has more than any other carefully secured at all times the canonical number. The Church of Rome's practice is not so regular. For instance, the Roman Catholic Church in the United States was founded by Dr. England, Bishop of Charleston, who seems to have been the only link in the succession at the outset.

As this treatise has been dedicated to King Oscar by his special permission, it may be taken for granted that His Majesty is desirous of seeing the Church placed in a Catholic position. And as it may be hoped that intercommunion with the Church of England is only a question of time, that happy event might be accelerated if, after a most careful inquiry into the full circumstances of the case, a suffragan of Canterbury and the Primus of Scotland were invited to take part in a consecration. We conclude by expressing a hope that in a future edition of this interesting little work, Dr. Nicholson will add the full text of Petrus Magni's Protest, the form for the Consecration of Bishops, a catena of the succession in each See, and the form of the Order of the Coronation of the Kings of Sweden.

1. *The Book of Private Prayer.* (London: J. Whitaker, 1880.)
2. *Family Prayers.* (London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin, and Co., 1880.)

It seems at first sight surprising that the Church of England should not yet possess any authorized and generally accepted forms of private or of family prayer. It is not for want of endeavours in that direction; and that from a date anterior to the origin of the Book of Common Prayer itself. A 'Prymer in English,' of about the end of the fourteenth century, was printed by Mr. Maskell in vol. ii. of his valuable *Monumenta Ritualia.* Three Primers appeared in the reign of King Henry VIII., between 1535 and 1545, all containing short forms for the Seven Hours. The last of these, commonly spoken of as 'King Henry's Primer,' was reprinted, each time with some alterations, in King Edward's reign, in 1547, 1549, 1551, and 1552. In 1553 appeared *The Primer, or Book of Private Prayer,* modelled on the Book of Common Prayer. This contains only Morning and Evening Prayer, with varying Psalms and Lessons, for each of the seven mornings and evenings of the week. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign a return was made to the earlier form of Primer, that of 1559 being a reprint of the Primer of 1552. But in 1560, and again in 1563, reprints were issued of the Edwardian Primer of 1553. Yet neither these, nor the illustrated *Book of Christian Prayers,* first published in 1569, and again, with considerable alterations, in 1578 and afterwards, nor the Latin *Orarium* (1560), and *Preces Privatæ* (1564), prepared for the use of the studious, seem to have been at all generally adopted by those for whose use they were intended, or to have held their ground for any length of time. The causes of this lie partly, no doubt, in the general un-

Digitized by Google

settlement of a time of religious change; but also partly (we think) in the character of the books themselves. The obvious fault of the earlier Primers, and of their reprints in Elizabeth's reign, is that they are miserably meagre representatives of the ancient *Hours*; such as devout persons, if accustomed to the fuller forms of the old Breviary, would never be likely to accept in lieu of them; while, if not so accustomed, they would certainly never be won to that form of devotion for private or household use by the bald and mutilated presentation of it provided in the Primers. And this would undoubtedly be still more the case with the studious and scholarly. Of such there were not at that time many, even among the clergy; and, of the few there were, many would probably be content with the private use of the Book of Common Prayer. As compared with that indeed, the Primers of the later series, beginning with 1553, would obviously have no chance; since any who liked that form of devotion for private use might just as well, or better, have used the Prayer-Book itself, and probably did so. All that was needed more (and we are half inclined to say, all that is needed now) for general use in private was a tolerably full authorized appendix of *Orationes ad diversa*, or 'Prayers and thanksgivings for various objects and occasions.' This might easily have been so arranged as to cover all the ground that the Common Prayer itself did not cover; and much of it, after sufficiently lengthened sifting and trial, might usefully have been permitted for use, at discretion, in the Public Service. Something of this kind is almost universally admitted to be necessary now, to supplement the felt insufficiency of our Public Prayers for the more varied requirements of modern Church life.

In later times, especially by Cosin in 1627, and again by others after the Restoration, many valuable manuals of private devotion were issued, but not by authority. Our own times have seen a large production of such books, and among them the two placed at the head of this notice, the first modern attempts to meet the want by authority. For these, the first of which is issued by a Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury (but as yet only tentatively, and not with the authority of the House), while the second is 'prepared by a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury,' and 'published by authority of the House,' we do not anticipate a much larger measure of success. Indeed, considering especially the large number and varied character of the very excellent manuals for private and family use now current in the Church, we hardly think them likely, especially the first, to come into use at all; certainly not in their present form.

The Committee of the Lower House, in the preface to their report introducing *The Book of Private Prayer*, themselves remark that 'they find so many excellent collections of prayers for this purpose have already been published, that they hesitate to add to their number, and indeed feel some doubt whether they can in this respect improve on the labours of others.' To this admission they add, with a charming *naïveté* (what seems to indicate a somewhat unfortunate selection of the Committee): 'Had these works been brought to the

Digitized by Google

notice of the Committee before they commenced their labours, it is possible that they would have hesitated to embark upon the matter at all.' This is remarkable, certainly. An outsider would have supposed that a full acquaintance, not only with ancient liturgical stores, but with the devotions now actually current among us, would have been among the first necessary qualifications for a task in many ways so difficult and delicate.

Looking at the book itself, it is needless to say that there is nothing to object to in the matter or substance of it, though some of the prayers are much too long and too rhetorical. The arrangement of the selected Psalms is open to criticism, *e.g.*, in allotting Psalm 23 to Friday rather than to Thursday; 69 to Saturday rather than to Friday; and 22 to 'eventide' on Friday rather than to 'noon.' The provision of an office for the Seven Hours of the day, as well as the association of a special subject or mystery with each hour, will commend itself to many among us; though we fear that just that very class of minds will be apt to prefer the old Canonical Hours, which are now obtainable in English adapted to modern use, and of which we hope yet to see more perfect and more generally acceptable editions. Premising that the notice prefixed to the published edition invites 'suggestions for its improvement,' to be sent to Lord Alwyne Compton (whose change of address, from Chadstone to The Deanery, Worcester, we heartily rejoice to note), we have ourselves marked the following as defects and objections, some of them, perhaps, remediable :—

1. The entire absence of any Litanies.

2. The absence in the form of confession of any address to God *as Father*, which is noticeably found in all our Prayer-Book Confessions.

3. The misplacement of the Collect for the day immediately after the opening Lord's Prayer: a liturgical monstrosity only paralleled by—

4. The insertion of *seven Collects* (!) before 'O Lord, open Thou our lips.'

5. The insertion of 'O Lord, open Thou our lips,' at *every* Hour.

6. The misplacement of the Meditation, which would come better before the commencement of the Office, as a sort of preparation and 'directing the intention.'

7. The insertion of a Creed at every Hour.

8. The unprecedented use of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and worse, of *portions* of them. There is great wisdom in the prohibition, inserted in the Shortened Services Act, of the use of any portion of the Communion Service (including, of course, the Nicene Creed) in the compilation of the additional and special services permitted by that Act.

9. The absence of the *Kyrie* and *Paternoster* before the concluding prayers, and of any *Preces*, or Versicles and Responses. We think that such versicles are just as appropriate in the private as in the social or public recitation of an office, and we miss them much; while the omission of the central Lord's Prayer, with its introductory

Digitized by Google

Kyrie, seems to us absolutely intolerable, and to betray an entire absence of all liturgical instinct, though we have had, alas, to submit to it, under the Shortened Services Act, even in Bishops' Chapels. Surely that central Lord's Prayer is the very core and kernel of the whole office, the one absolutely essential feature, the point from which all else before and after has radiated in exact correspondence with its own structure: Praise first, in the Psalms, &c., to answer to 'Hallowed be Thy Name;' then the reading of the Word, answering to 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done;' and Prayer afterwards, answering to the later petitions.

10. The omission of the Antiphon or Anthem, and the Versicle and Response, inserted before the Memorials in the ancient forms.

11. The monotonous identity of structure in all the seven forms. In the old *Hours* the structure of Lauds, Vespers, and Compline differed from that of the Day Hours, so giving variety.

12. The Blessing at Eventide. The good rule prohibiting the use on other occasions of portions of the Communion office, applies to this as well as to the proposed unusual use of the Nicene Creed.

13. The hymns, too, at the Day Hours are misplaced between the Lesson and its Canticle. They ought to come before the Psalms. Our principle is this, that, over against the long unbroken compositions, popular in uncatholic and anti-catholic quarters, the Church has always favoured the use of various constituents in devotional formularies, Hymns, Psalms, Lessons, Canticles, Responses, Collects, &c.; but that these constituents have always been arranged *on a principle and in a certain well-established order*, and that in the compilation of devotional forms out of these constituents an arbitrary departure from that order is not to be tolerated. Thus in the Bishops' Book of *Family Prayers* the placing of the Lesson *before* the Psalm has an awkward wrong-side-up kind of effect. The households in which the book will be used will be all familiar with the recognized order of the Book of Common Prayer, and will be simply puzzled and put out by meaningless departures from it. A long inclusive prayer ending with the Lord's Prayer is another thing. It stands on distinct grounds of its own, has at least the advantage of simplicity, and is, we think, really preferable to a series of liturgical materials shuffled anyhow. Yet the Bishops' Book has very much to recommend it in respect of its matter, if only the following slight changes in arrangement could be made, so as to bring its order into closer conformity with what Church people are accustomed to. The Psalms should precede the Lesson, and the Hymn the Creed; while the Lord's Prayer, preceded by the mutual Salutation with the *Oremus* and *Kyrie*, should be placed at the beginning of the prayers instead of at the end. In like manner, in the Litany, the *Kyrie* and Lord's Prayer should be placed before the Versicles and Responses at the close of the Litany proper, instead of at the end of the Collects. The Litanies themselves are good, and so are all the newly composed prayers in the Book, especially those based on New Testament passages. We have doubts about the short 'Confessions of Faith' provided as alternatives to the Apostles' Creed. Looking at the

Digitized by Google

generality of households into which it is hoped such a book may penetrate, and at the needs of servants and of the young, we doubt the expediency of multiplying common forms, such *e.g.* as confessions of sin and creeds. Yet we think the Friday Confession, from the 51st Psalm, a real gain, if only the words 'Our Father' were inserted after 'O God' in the first line; the words '*Here let a short pause be made*,' inserted in parenthesis between 'before me' and 'Turn Thy face;' and 'Grant this, O Father, for His merits' sake, Who died and was buried, and rose again for us, Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord,' were added at the end. This last we consider essential. In the Prayer-Book no prayer addressed to the Father (except, very oddly, the Bishop's prayers in the Confirmation Service) is without its plea 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord,' and the last place where this should be omitted is surely a prayer for forgiveness. Thus amended, we would make this the daily confession, confining it, on the whole, to the evening; and would banish all the rest, except the very good form given for use on Saturdays, which, however, is rather a prayer for forgiveness, and a very solemn and touching one, than a confession of sin. The only defect or omission of any importance which we note is that of a prayer for use during the week, or at least on Thursday and Saturday evenings, in preparation for the Communion of Sunday. The good general prayer appointed for Sunday morning is not full enough on that special point, and comes too late. An early celebration would be over before it was used. Lastly, we would suggest that the Morning and Evening prayers be printed consecutively for each day, rather than all the mornings and then all the evenings. This last is, to be sure, the arrangement of the Roman Breviary. We do not know whether this recommended it to the Bishops.

The Convocation Prayer-Book, being the Book of Common Prayer with Altered Rubrics. (London: John Murray, 1880.)

MR. MURRAY deserves our best thanks for this most useful volume. The 'altered rubrics' show what would be the condition of the Prayer-Book if amended in conformity with the recommendations of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, contained in the reports presented last year to the Queen, as the results of the Letters of Business that had been granted to those bodies. These new rubrics have, of course, no authority. But they are of great value and interest as exhibiting the changes agreed upon after years of deliberation by the two Convocations. And no doubt they will be to some extent followed, if not in present practice, yet in future legislation. The new or amended rubrics are clearly marked by thick square brackets; and all the points of difference insisted upon by the Northern Convocation are distinguished by foot-notes with the word *York* appended in italics. This book will be useful to all clergymen, as for instance in its careful rules for the concurrence of festivals, and it will be actually indispensable in all future discussions of proposed changes in the Prayer-Book. Added to which the practical convenience of seeing the amended rubrics in their proper

Digitized by Google

places, instead of having to search for them in the Reports of Convocation, is one for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful.

A Church of England Hymn Book, adapted to the Daily Services of the Church throughout the Year. Compiled and edited by the Rev. GODFREY THRING. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1880.)

WE are ready to give a cordial welcome to any well-meant and well-executed contribution to the hymnody of the Church. And we had hoped much from Mr. Godfrey Thring's long expected compilation. We are the more sorry to be unable to speak of it in very laudatory terms now that it has appeared. In fact, it disappoints us very much on a careful examination of its contents. We may first say, in passing, that, in spite of the publisher's warm commendation of the attractive getting-up of Mr. Thring's book, we think its form singularly uninviting. It is a thick squat book, in a sad-coloured green cloth binding; and its pages are disfigured by the addition of marks of musical expression to almost every line of every hymn. We know that there are precedents for this; but we think them not worth following. Surely it is better to allow choir-masters and precentors a little liberty in this matter of emphasis. Mr. Thring himself admits that the tunes themselves ought not to be stereotyped. In public hymnody an exaggerated and strictly regulated artificial emphasis is even worse, to our mind, than the opposite extreme. What would be thought of a book of common or private prayers marked with the accents and italics suggested by an 'elocution master?' The 'saying' of prayers on a monotone is our happy protection from the polytonic vagaries of individual caprice or conceit. Hymns, after all, have a devotional value and purpose in people's private devotions, which is scarcely less important than their effective musical rendering in the congregation. We contend that marks of musical expression ought to be confined to the noted books used by the choir.

In an interesting preface Mr. Thring lays down some valuable rules for forming a hymn book, in most of which we agree thoroughly. But we do not think he has been successful in the practical application of his own rules. We think it quite right to exclude many of the sentimental egotistical hymns, of a purely subjective character, which disfigure some modern collections. But far too many of this kind are to be found in Mr. Thring's own book, some of which too bear his own honoured name. It is almost inconceivable that the compiler should have admitted such a hymn as 'Come unto Me, ye weary,' which in the second and third verses presumes to give paraphrases, or rather parodies, of our Lord's own words, and to call them respectively the 'loving' and the 'cheering voice of Jesus.' We doubt whether a lower bathos of bad taste has ever been reached in a high-class hymn book than in the following verse of hymn 500, one meant for congregational use at Holy Communion by a (happily) anonymous author. We quote it *verbatim* with its marks of expression:—

Digitized by Google

p. Are all things ready?—Is the heart prepared?
Invited guest, O search that heart and see:
cres. The waiting feast,—by whom shall it be shared?
m.f. Oh, is all ready?—*p.* All, excepting thee!

In the next place Mr. Thring takes credit to himself for strict adherence to the 'broad and general principles upon which our Church is founded.' In this worthy aim he does not stand alone, as he seems to think he does, among modern hymnologists. In the carrying out of his aim he does not seem to us particularly happy. There is a hazy use of the word 'Sabbath' for the Lord's Day. On the other hand, not only are Wesley's fine Eucharistic hymns omitted, but comparatively few of the noble dogmatic hymns of the mediæval Church find a place in this collection. These latter are invaluable, not only as a connecting link with the earlier ages of the Church, but for their teaching value. It is true that many of the translations of the old Latin hymns are crabbed and unpoetical. And we strongly sympathize with Mr. Thring's desire to make his hymns poetry as well as verse. But he might have improved the existing translations or produced better ones. The close and vigorous translation of the *Vexilla Regis*, as it stands, after the polishing work of many hands, in the 'Hymnary,' is an example in point. It is almost incredible that this fine hymn does not appear in Mr. Thring's book, except in the insipid paraphrase from Mr. Chope's collection. After all, the Latin hymns, whatever be the ruggedness of their English form, are far too precious to be abandoned. We notice with great regret that the following among others are wholly omitted: the *Veni, veni, Emmanuel*, the *Creator alme siderum*, the *O filii et filiæ*, and the *Sponsa Christi*. The *Dies Iræ* appears with ever so many stanzas omitted. The only ancient hymn retained for Christmas-tide is the *Adeste fideles*. The greater antiphons, beginning with *O Sapientia*, do not appear. No ancient hymn for Lent is preserved. The old Ambrosian Easter hymns have vanished. Only one ancient hymn is saved in the Proper of Saints, and not even one in the Common of Saints. The insertion of 'God save the Queen' as a hymn for use in church is no compensation for these *hiatus valde deflendi*. One of the most beautiful of hymns, Mr. Ellerton's 'Welcome, happy morning,' for Easter (a translation of the *Salve, festa dies*), is conspicuous by its absence. Other omissions may be accounted for, perhaps by the scarcely generous rule of the proprietors of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, who, in Mr. Thring's case as in other instances, have, as Mr. Thring tells us in his preface, 'unlike other compilers and authors, refused to allow the insertion of hymns of which they hold the copyright.' The present compiler, however, has followed the bad precedent set by *Hymns Ancient and Modern* in changing Faber's beautiful refrain, 'Jesus, our Love, is crucified'—itself an echo from S. Ignatius—into 'Jesus, our Lord.'

Finally, regarded as a companion to the Church's yearly cycle of worship, this book is certainly inferior to some of its predecessors. For example, the Circumcision has, strictly speaking, no proper hymn at all. New Year's Day is overburdened with no less than eight.

Digitized by Google

The *Alleluia dulce carmen* is ordered to be used 'before Lent' instead of 'before Septuagesima.' The Septuagesima season is most meagrely provided for, there being only one hymn for each Sunday. The Lent hymns are too few, and Passion Sunday is not marked at all. On the other hand, the Occasional Offices are amply supplied. And the general hymns are very numerous, though at the expense of the proper seasons, for which many, reckoned under this head by Mr. Thring, were originally written.

We are very sorry that we cannot speak more favourably of this compilation as a whole. It is scarcely likely to supersede any of its predecessors, and we think it would be a retrograde step for any congregation to adopt it in place of most older collections. But we do not deny that it has considerable merits. It bears marks of careful and loving thought. And it will have a value for private use. Mr. Thring's own compositions, which are numerous, are many of them already well known and highly prized. They are all far above the average standard of modern hymns. The book is well indexed.

Sanctorale Catholicum; or, Book of Saints; with Notes Critical, Exegetical, and Historical. By the Rev. ROBERT OWEN, B.D. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1880.)

MR. OWEN'S *Introduction to the Study of Dogmatic Theology*, published so long ago as 1858, gave a promise of literary activity which has not been fulfilled. But we welcome kindly the quaint and attractive volume which has again brought his name before us. Every one who knows the *Roman Martyrology* must have felt the peculiar charm with which its daily record of the triumphs of faith in every age and clime seems to invest the great truth of the Communion of Saints. The sense of the oneness and continuity of the Church is borne in upon the soul most forcibly by the endless procession of the saints and martyrs, confessors and doctors, of successive ages, which the roll of a *Sanctorale* unfolds before the mental eye. The earliest Martyrologies were little more than catalogues of names, with, however, here and there invaluable additions of chronological, biographical, and geographical particulars, that often, if not always, enshrine germs of truth that are of the greatest interest to theological and historical students. But, as time went on, innumerable fables, some highly poetical and instructive, others puerile and grossly exaggerated, became encrusted on the original records. The famous *Golden Legend* is the most familiar type of this popular and uncritical kind of martyrology; and in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists is to be found the vastest compilation of all the materials, good, bad, and indifferent, of an exhaustive history of the saints of the Christian Church. Mr. Owen tells us in his preface that he had originally intended to compose some such digest of these materials as Mr. Baring-Gould has anticipated him in producing in his voluminous *Lives of the Saints*. But his actual work, now before us, is very different. He carefully avoids the emotional treatment adopted by the last-named writer. Above all, he includes in his list many of the 'just men' who have lived in the Anglican Communion since its

Digitized by Google

severance from the See of Rome. Thus Andrewes and Bedell, Berkeley and Beveridge, Bull and Butler, Charles I. and Cosin, Nicholas Ferrar and Herbert, Hickes and Hooker, Samuel Johnson, Keble and Kenn, Laud, Leighton, Robert Nelson and Sir Isaac Newton, Sancroft, Shakspeare, Thorndike, Ussher and Wesley, and Thomas Wilson, among others, figure as English worthies and 'famous men,' in this latest *Sanctorale.* Mr. Owen's notes are often highly piquant. They deal severely with many fables of the Roman Breviary, and apply, most unexpectedly, many lessons of the past to present political and ecclesiastical difficulties. They have thus the personal interest that attaches to the lucubrations of writers of an older school. Of course multitudes of names, of doubtful authority, or of comparatively small interest, are excised altogether. But Mr. Owen has shown a pardonable indulgence to the claims of ancient British and Irish, and more especially of Welsh, saints. S. Iltutus the Abbot, S. Petrock, S. Tudno, and the saints of the Island of Bardsey, may be specified. To the commemoration of the latter saints this characteristic note is appended :—

'The insula de Henli (I quote a Papal rescript), in Welsh "Ynys Enlli, the isle in the flood," was the Iona of Wales; the most ancient monastic establishment in North Wales, the retreat of Cambrian saints, the sepulchre of the chiefs, and a famous place of pilgrimage. A singular relic of olden time still lingers on down to the present day. For a farm, on the southern slope of the romantic Eivl mountain, remains tithe-free, charged from ancient times with the duty of supplying homely refreshment to the weary pilgrim bound on the holy errand to Bardsey. The charge is no longer onerous.'

We can promise any one, who will read day by day the commemorations of Mr. Owen's *Sanctorale Catholicum*, a feast of entertainment as well as of most suggestive instruction for a whole year.

Facsimile of the De Imitatione Christi. The Imitation of Christ: being the Autograph Manuscript of Thomas à Kempis, reproduced in facsimile from the Original preserved in the Royal Library at Brussels. With an Introduction by CHARLES RUELENS, Keeper of the Department of Manuscripts, Royal Library, Brussels. London: Elliot Stock, 1879.)

IF any uninspired book deserved the honour of such a loving and costly facsimile reproduction of the original autograph manuscript as this, it is undoubtedly the famous *Imitation* of Thomas à Kempis; the work which, next to the Bible itself, has (it is said) seen the greatest number of editions. The facsimile is a perfect triumph of typographical art. Photozincography has reproduced every stroke of the original manuscript. The paper was made expressly for this work in Holland, and is an exact copy in texture and colour of the original. The binding is imitated from a contemporary Dutch specimen of a Book of Hours. It is a most precious and dainty little volume of about 200 pages, only $4\frac{1}{2}$ by $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size, and deserves to be kept in the box with which the publisher has provided every copy of the reprint. There is a large margin, and the manuscript, which is

Digitized by Google

very illegible, cramped, and contracted, only occupies a space of 3 by 2 inches on each page. M. Ruelens, who has edited the work, prefixes an excellent dissertation in English. He tells us that the *codex* ends with these words: 'Finitus et completus anno domini mccccxli. per manus fratris thome Kempis in monte sancte Agnetis prope zwollis.' A note on the fly-leaf records that the book originally belonged to the monastery of the Canons Regular of Mount Saint Agnes near Zwolle. This house perished during the rising of the Netherlands against Spain, and the Brethren took refuge at S. Martin's, Louvain, which belonged to the same Order. In 1577 Johannes Latomus, prior of the Monastery of the Throne near Herenthals, seems to have recovered this manuscript from the ruins of Mount S. Agnes, and to have given it before his death, which happened in 1578, to his friend, John Bellère. This Bellère was a learned man and an eminent printer at Antwerp. He had two sons, who were Jesuits. Through their influence the precious *codex* was given to the Jesuits' house in Antwerp, whence, on the suppression of the Order, it passed into the Burgundian Library at Brussels. No question could have arisen as to the authorship of the *Imitatio*, and no one would have suggested the claims of Gerson, or of the imaginary Gessen or Gersen, had the colophon quoted above been understood to mean more than that Thomas à Kempis was the scribe or copyist of the volume. But it was in vain that Bishop Malou, of Bruges, asserted that Thomas, by copying the four books of the *Imitatio* at the head of other works, of which he was indisputably the author, practically 'declared himself to be the author' of them all. It was left to Dr. Carl Hirsche, of Hamburg, to decide the prolonged controversy by discovering, on a careful collation of the manuscript, certain peculiarities of punctuation, and above all, certain rhythmical and condensed periods, which seem to distinguish all the writings of Thomas à Kempis, and which are above all conspicuous in the *Imitatio*. Indeed, a fifteenth-century manuscript of the *Imitatio*, preserved at Brussels, is described at the beginning and the end as *Libellus musice ecclesiastice;* which was a wholly unintelligible title until Dr. Hirsche's discovery. Add to which, that the chronicler, Adrian de But, writing in 1480, speaks of 'frater Thomas de Kempis de monte Sanctae Agnetis' as the author of 'quoddam volumen *metrice* super illud "Qui sequitur me;"' *i.e.* the opening words of the *Imitatio*. We think that the claims of Gerson are finally disposed of by the accumulative internal evidence which we have thus briefly described.

Dr. Hirsche has published a rhythmically arranged edition of the Latin text; and we are told that an English edition, imitating this rhythm, is in preparation. We fear it will be a failure: for how can any translation give the effect of the original cadences? This little book will be a choice present to lovers of the *Imitatio*, even though few will be able to decipher the text. The printing of the English preface is a marvel of typographical beauty. If done at Brussels, it reflects the more credit upon all concerned.

Digitized by Google

A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines; being a Continuation of the Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and HENRY WACE, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Vol. II.—*Eaba—Hermocrates.* (London : John Murray, 1880.)

THE second volume of this valuable work has followed the first with a commendable promptness, which speaks of really surprising industry and labour on the part of those on whom lies the burden of editing and arrangement ; not to speak of the contributors, of whom, however, there are many, and whose work is therefore the lighter.

The Dictionary appears to us to have somewhat changed its character during the incubation of the present volume, and to have become far more comprehensive and encyclopædic in character. Indeed, the editors explain that this is the case, and that, therefore, the work will extend to four volumes instead of three, as originally proposed. 'They felt,' they explain in a somewhat pedantic way, 'that the value of a dictionary of early Christian biography would depend both upon the completeness of its onomasticon and upon its thorough discussion of the greater names.' What the editors meant we presume by this tautological sentence *was* an *onomasticon*, i.e. a dictionary or register of names; and no doubt this is a useful aim for the editors to have put before their eyes. A little more severity of editorial control would, however, have saved, it seems to us, a good deal of space that here is occupied with but little advantage, if not to the very reverse. Thus we find four several paragraphs headed with the name *Eadbert* or Eadberht and referring to the *same* person. Surely all these should have appeared at the head of one and the same paragraph.

We are somewhat at a loss also to determine the principle which has governed the editors in accepting or refusing names. It is not at all obvious why such names as EDOBICUS, EGBERT, most of the Gothic kings, GUNTRAMNUS BOSO, and similar personages should have been included. The insertion of the name of the Empress HELENA no doubt may be justified by her having come into contact with the succession of events at an interesting point ; but what place have HADRIAN, HERACLIUS, GORDIANUS, GALLUS, and others of the Emperors in a dictionary of Christian biography? We could understand the insertion of all names without distinction in a general biographical dictionary, but we do not understand that it is desired or aimed at to make the present work assume that character ; and it would seem to be increasing the bulk of the work needlessly to insert *some* personages of secular history whose *rapports* with its special subject of the history of religion are at all events but slight.

Passing by this and such further considerations of the same class as suggest themselves, the general execution of the work seems to us thoroughly good. The separate articles include, indeed, a great number that will never, in all probability, be of the slightest use to anybody, since these are brief notices of persons of whom nothing is known save a single mention in some early or mediæval writer; a

Digitized by Google

reason which, to our mind, hardly justifies their insertion by the hundred. But the more considerable articles are in every case worthily done. *Apocryphal Gospels* is by the veteran Professor Lipsius of Jena, and has been admirably translated, evidently by the hand of a master; it is a most learned and meritorious essay worthily rendered. *The Fathers* seems to us, though not otherwise than praiseworthy, not quite equal to other things we have from the same pen. *Ethiopian Church* struck us in reading to be not quite sympathetically written. The week of the Passion, i.e. Holy Week, is spoken of as 'Passion Week,' according to a later and incorrect usage, and the sacerdotal idea is apparently denounced as 'a strong Jewish element.' On looking at the list of writers we find that the initials H. R. R. appended to this article denote the Rev. H. R. Reynolds, D.D., President of Cheshunt College; but we think Dr. Reynolds might have made somewhat more allowance for the peculiarities, even if strange and unfamiliar to him, of the hierarchical system of the Abyssinian Church.

Under the heading GREGORY we have not less than eighty articles, and it is remarkable to notice how many distinguished men in ecclesiastical history bore this name. Some of these, however, were mere nobodies, of whom little or nothing is known—*voces et præterea nihil*—and not a few were laymen. *Gregorius Nazianzenus*, by Professor —now Archdeacon—Watkins, is especially spirited and accurate. On the other hand, we cannot think the article GOD at all worthy of the dignity of its subject. Partly commonplace and partly inadequate, it merely refers to parts of its subject, which ought to have been fully gone into and discussed. Thus, for example, the treatment of an idea which lay at the bottom of most of the heresies which flourished during the Gnostic period, for (say) two hundred years, viz. that of the *singleness* or *simplicity* of the Divine Nature (*natura illa simplex*, to use Origen's phrase), is most insufficient, the subject being dismissed in just six lines.

We will not, however, continue the disagreeable task of fault-finding; nor, indeed, is it needful to do so, for, on the whole, the work is executed with great care and is of a surprisingly high standard. It will be an addition to our English literature which was much needed, and will no doubt prove to be, when complete, of great and permanent value.

Mr. Parker's Fallacies Refuted. A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Selborne on the Advertisements and Ornaments Rubric. By the Rev. W. MILTON, M.A. (London: J. F. Shaw, 1880.)

MR. MILTON'S process of what he calls refuting Mr. Parker is that stale poor trick of minor controversialists which consists in borrowing their adversaries' terminology, and then perverting it to some totally different meaning from that which it had been adopted to imply. After this the sophist has only to perform the childishly easy task of crowing over the discrepancies between the facts as they really oc-

Digitized by Google

curred and what they would naturally have turned out if the pretended premisses had been any true representation of things as they really were. For example, Mr. Parker shows conclusively that Elizabeth never 'took Order' through means of the Advertisements in any way which a constitutional lawyer would respect and recognize, and Mr. Milton pretends to demolish him by wilfully misunderstanding the expression 'Order' and assuming some 'word of mouth' Order on the Queen's part, which no court nowadays, or perhaps at any time, would have recognized. Again, he struggles to evade the fatal absence of even the semblance of authority for the Advertisements within the Province of York by juggling with a preliminary direction to that Province, as if it had the force of a consummated procedure, giving to the Advertisements validity in the Northern Province.

All this nibbling at Mr. Parker is, however, only the padding of the biggest and most grotesque mare's-nest against which we have ever stumbled. Mr. Milton boldly seizes the Ornaments Rubric by the throat, and proclaims that he of all men who have ever lived is the first to whom have been revealed the profundities which underlie that mystic phrase 'in this Church of England *by* authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI.' So well did Elizabeth, Parker, and Cecil keep their secret; so close, mute, and uninquiring were Parliament and Convocation in that apathetic age, —so also those revisers of 1661—so wary even now have been Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne—that the privilege of the great revelation has been reserved to the laborious pamphleteer, in whom English literature again boasts of a Milton, raised, like his great namesake, to smite the sacerdotalists hip and thigh by revealing the true scope of a provision in an Act of Parliament, and of a rubric, over which for more than three hundred years the acuteness of lawyers has been foolishness and the lore of canonists ignorance. Burghley, when he assented to or perhaps proposed the mysterious 'by,' put more meaning into that monosyllable even than he commanded when, as we learn from the *Critic*, he so emphatically shook his head. We all of us know that it is a rule in drafting Statutes that the expressions employed in them shall, as far as possible, not explain their own meaning, but shall contain covert and figurative allusions to other expressions, calling for a constant exercise of the imaginative or poetical faculty, on the part of the jurists and the Courts who have to interpret them, in order that they may apprehend those latent innuendoes which must be guessed in order to reach the esoteric meaning of the statute. It is equally axiomatic that this principle of elliptical drafting is most habitual and appropriate in statutes like Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which embody severe coercive penalties against infraction of their provisions.

In the present case Mr. Milton's lucid analysis has fastened upon 'by,' and he has evolved the great fact that 'by' is not exactly 'with,' nor 'with' quite 'by.' The chain of the argument is now complete. When Elizabeth's legislators enacted that those ornaments of the minister were to be retained and be in use as were 'in this Church of

Digitized by Google

England *by* authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI.,' Parliament enacted with a force and a precision which leaves nothing to be desired that such ornaments of the minister are *not* to be retained and be in use as were in the Church of England '*with* authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI.' Mr. Milton condescendingly explains that 'by authority' means by that particular and sole authority, and '*with* authority' not only by that particular authority, but by some other concurrent authority also. The upshot of this burlesque argument is that because priests did *not* say Mass in cope and surplice before the Reformation, therefore these vestures were 'by' authority of Parliament in 1549; and because they did say Mass before the Reformation in chasuble and alb, therefore these vestures were 'with' authority of Parliament in 1549. So cope and surplice stand, chasuble and alb fall. We shall not insult our readers, who understand something of drafting, 'by' or 'with' any refutation of this absurd suggestion. But we must gratify Mr. Milton by pointing out one result of this theory which he does not seem to have considered. Before the Reformation the clergy wore their surplices when they said their morning and evening services in Church, and by the Prayer-Book of 1549 they still say them in surplices. It is clear then by Mr. Milton's proposition that the use of the surplice in 1549 was 'with' and not 'by' authority of Parliament, and is therefore not covered by the legislation of 1559.

Mr. Whalley was much laughed at when he brought in a bill ordering the clergy to wear a surplice and nothing else. Mr. Milton would even strip himself of that poor rag of Popery. For a time he might like Eve stand naked but not ashamed; but he would soon find that his paradise, which we cannot compliment him by terming a paradise of the wise, had become paradise lost.

Mr. Milton becomes quite pathetic when he confides to the public and Lord Selborne in reference to his great discovery, that 'I regret to know, from correspondence with which you have honoured me, that it is one on which I have not yet succeeded in carrying your lordship with me.' Mr. Milton as a man, a minister, and a controversialist, is vexed at heart that the jurist whom he delights to honour should be so slow in apprehending an argument which, as propounded by himself, ought to have secured unquestioning adherence from the ex-Chancellor, 'for, advocated by yourself, and applied with the legal accuracy and accomplished insight, which characterizes your lordship's mind, to the extensive ramifications of this wide subject, it would rapidly gain the attention and adhesion of all impartial Churchmen, and furnish the long vainly sought solution of the vestiarian problem.' At last, to our great pleasure, we have reached the point of perfect agreement with Mr. Milton. When Lord Selborne shall have made himself the unquestioning mouthpiece of Mr. Milton's crotchets, the vestiarian problem will have been solved.

Digitized by Google

The Cambridge Bible for Schools. General Editor,—J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough. *The Epistle to the Romans.* With Introduction and Notes by the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (For the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge and London, 1879.)

A FEW years ago it would have been thought a strange thing that a Dean of Peterborough should condescend to edit a book for schools. It would have been thought more strange, and perhaps with reason, that he should include among his sub-editors, for a biblical commentary for boys and girls, the names of any Nonconformist scholars (however eminent), and that he should see no objection to present to those, who are expected to learn from the several volumes, varieties of opinion on 'points of doctrine,' and 'questions . . . of the deepest theological import,' such as should make it worth his while to write a preface declaring his irresponsibility.

However, the volume now before us is one which we can honestly welcome. Mr. Moule (who is in some sort known to us as a writer of religious poetry, and as a member of a family distinguished for missionary zeal as well as for academical attainments) has produced a commentary which is thoroughly up to the mark in point of accurate scholarship and acquaintance with the result of textual and critical inquiry. Having gone through several chapters point by point we neither miss any critical note, nor find any statement which has not at least fair and probable ground. In iii. 31 we might suggest 'the faith' as a better version than 'faith?'

Perhaps the Epistle to the Romans will not be a subject very frequently read in schools. Yet the sketch of S. Paul's life (17 pp., with a map) may be found useful for other Epistles and the Acts. The Argument of the Epistle takes 16 pp. of close print. We think there are in the notes some passages which are beyond a lad's capacity. For instance, he might want help to connect the excellent exposition which is given of xiv. 23 with the English text presented to him. We do not know in what relation this series of the English *Bible for Schools* will stand towards the *Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges*, which the same general editor has projected and announced; but the English reader will be glad to find the quantities of the crucial proper names in chap. xvi. properly marked for him, while the Greek student need not (we think) be ashamed to take this volume for an authority on points of scholarship. With this view, the note on *severity* (xi. 22), and one on the manuscript abbreviation in xii. 11, might have been slightly expanded. Should not *pursuing . . . persecute* on p. 211, be added to the instances of play on words?

We may mention the note on *mystery* (xi. 25) as worthy of attention; so also is the following (i. 25). '*Benedictus* here, not *Beatus*. The glorious epithet indicates the Creature's right attitude toward the Creator; that of adoring praise and love.' To this note a cross-reference might have been given at ix. 5; as also from xi. 25 to xvi. 25.

Digitized by Google

Meyer and Alford appear to be the commentators to whom direct reference is given. The doctrinal character of the work is 'Evangelical,' modified in the school of Dr. Westcott and Bishop Lightfoot.

We will conclude with a few instances and detached sentences, whence our readers may judge of the character of the book.

Romans vii. 14 is understood to refer to S. Paul in his regenerate state, where Bishops Wordsworth and Moberly (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), after S. Jerome, take him to be speaking of the purely natural man. In xii. 19, Mr. Moule, with Wordsworth, explains *the wrath* to be that of the enemy or oppressor :—

'vi. 3, *so many of us*, &c.: Not implying that some were and some were not. This is plain from the Gr. *All* Christian believers are contemplated; for each his baptism was all this, if a true baptism. This and ver. 4 contain the only mentions of Baptism in the Epistle. He refers the converts to their baptism, as to the great crisis of their lives, when, having already, by Divine grace, "turned from idols to serve the living God," they made (so to speak) their formal self-surrender to their Redeemer, and received His formal acceptance of them as His own.'

viii. 19: '. . . Our best comment will be, then, 2 Peter iii., where we find (1) that the "Day of the Lord" (i.e. of resurrection and judgment) will be attended with the fiery dissolution of the present frame of things; and (2) that then, in modes absolutely unknown to us, there will be, as it were, a resurrection of the "heavens and earth;" or to keep close to Scripture, "new heavens and a new earth."'

viii. 23: '. . . Again remark this unique feature of Revealed Religion; an immortal prospect for the *body*. Some expositors take the body here to be the "mystical body," the Church. But the context,' &c.

ix. 11: 'It must be remembered that Divine Election affects a world not of righteous beings, nor even of neutral beings, but of "sinners." . . . The doctrine of Election is, in Scripture, never made the foreground of doctrine; and it . . . in Scripture is viewed always from the only safe view-point—the foot of the Cross.'

'In the closing paragraph of the Seventeenth Article the word "*generally*" is technical, and means "with regard to the genus"—i.e. probably, *mankind*. The Article warns us to begin with faith in the promises to man as man, not with the question of personal election.'—(p. 265).

ix. 22: 'From our point of view the two things' [free-will and predestination] 'are incompatible; but the Apostle assures us that both are *real* and therefore compatible . . . A seemingly rigid logic may say that the lost must be as truly predestined to death as the saved to life; but such logic is faulty in its premisses: *we do not know enough* of the Eternal Mind and the nature of things to reason so'—(p. 266). 'S. Augustine, the great patristic teacher of Predestination, carefully avoided such a tenet; teaching that, however little we can fathom the mystery, man's sin, running its proper course, is the only cause of man's ruin; while yet special grace is the only cause of his salvation.'

Appendices, p. 261: 'The fact that Abraham's faith was a staple Rabbinic text makes it perfectly possible that S. James had not Apostolic but *Rabbinic* teaching in view . . . "It is faith alone which justifies; but the faith which justifies can never be alone."'—(See also on ii. 7).

To any one who is entering on these perplexing subjects we would commend a careful reading of *Justification of Life* by Prebendary Sadler (G. Bell and Sons, 1877.)

Digitized by Google

The Gospel according to the Hebrews: its Fragments Translated and Annotated, with a Critical Analysis of the External and Internal Evidence relating to it. By EDWARD BYRON NICHOLSON, M.A., Principal Librarian and Superintendent of the London Institution. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1879.)

WHETHER there ever existed an authentic and trustworthy Gospel 'of' or 'according to' the Hebrews, which was composed in or shortly after the Apostolic age, but has since perished, is a question highly interesting indeed, but which may be thought not of great practical importance. Since it must be left indeterminate at length, the greater number of writers have deemed a cursory notice of it sufficient. Canon Westcott contents himself with reciting the few facts in ecclesiastical history which bear on the inquiry, but adds no distinct judgment of his own; while the strong opinion expressed by Mr. Baring-Gould seems to be not wholly borne out by ascertained facts.

It is this question which Mr. Nicholson has chosen to examine. His industrious investigation is confined mainly to the *external* evidence bearing on the question; he claims 'to have entered this field of literature in the cause neither of orthodox tradition nor its impugners,' and that his work has not been 'influenced, even unconsciously, by any religious opinions whatever.'

We cannot lay claim to so lofty an impartiality, and we say at once that we employ quite another criterion to obtain an answer to our question, and that we are far from satisfied to be told to accept, merely upon circumstantial evidence, as probably canonical, or at least as written by the same writer as the canonical Gospel of S. Matthew, this *quasi*-Gospel, of which every copy has vanished so strangely.

It must, perhaps, be conceded that there existed in the sub-apostolic age some book or writing passing under this name, though there is really a strange character of *hearsay* about most of the evidence adduced, which proves at all events that the book, if it existed, was by no means widely diffused, and was known, indeed, to comparatively few, at all events among the orthodox. Scarcely any of our witnesses had *himself* seen the book. S. Ignatius does not mention it. It is not certain that Papias does so. Clement of Alexandria couples it with a confessedly spurious writing. It is only by a sufficiently violent series of inferences that Irenæus can be held to have referred to it, unless the Gospel according to Matthew is to be considered as identical with that according to the Hebrews because it may possibly have been in the Hebrew language.

But, granting that it existed, the real question is whether it was held authentic and authoritative. We do not say *canonical*, for such a term would be a misnomer as applied to any document antecedently to the Council of Nicæa.[1] Mr. Nicholson does not apparently

[1] The term is, however, employed by Origen '*in Scripturis Canonicis*' (*De Principiis*, iv.), and in the prologue *in Cantic.* '*quæ in his Scripturis quas Canonicas habemus;*' but these are isolated instances, and the

Digitized by Google

succeed in establishing this. He shows that it is mentioned or referred to in a loose and general manner by certain writers, but he does no more than this. And it is certain that if the document in question had been held to be of any authority or account, much more than this would have been producible. Every one of the canonical Gospels, and, indeed, it may be said that all the canonical books of the New Testament (with a very few exceptions, readily accounted for), can appeal to the testimony of many Churches which possessed and used them, while no such testimony is found with respect to any others. We shall probably not be wrong in considering this fact as the *criterion* by which the two classes can be accurately distinguished, and to be regarded as the *punctum Archimedis* in investigating the Church history of the first age much more truly than the (very doubtful) statement to which that name is given by Hilgenfeld.

It is impossible, moreover, for Churchmen at all events to refrain from attaching a certain degree of weight to the consideration of the general character of the 'fragments' which we have put before us as relics of a lost Gospel. Mr. Nicholson may treat the matter, and we dare say has treated it, as a mere field for the display of his critical faculty; and having determined *ab extra*—irrespectively, that is, of the actual contents of the document—that it is to be considered authentic, may consider his work done, and not go on to consider what manner of sayings and doings they are which he has determined are to be added to our sacred books; but we can feel no such unconcern. And we cannot see our way to admiring such apocryphal stuff as that of which the 'fragments' for the most part consist: incredible and meaningless incidents, such as that of the carrying of our Lord by one of His hairs to Mount Tabor, or of the vow of S. James; circumstantial additions to narratives substantially correct, because borrowed from the four Gospels, such as the fall of the lintel of the Temple at the passion of our Lord; rabbinical conceits foisted into our Lord's teaching, although the Four show it to have been so remarkably free from these that His hearers took notice that 'He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes' (S. Matthew vii. 29); and even positive heresy, as where our Lord is made to accuse Himself of ignorance, if not of sin (p. 38), or where the Holy Spirit is called His mother (p. 74). We cannot, therefore, at all agree with Mr. Nicholson where he says, on p. 81, that some two or three passages which he refers to are 'all the passages in the Nazarene Gospel against which any but the most finikin criticism can be directed.' We are wholly at a loss to account for the admiration which here and elsewhere has been lavished upon even the most profound in appearance of the sayings here attributed to the Lord. 'He that hath marvelled shall reign, and he that hath reigned shall

systematic employment of the word may be said to have begun with S. Athanasius, i.e. in the Nicene period. These two facts would seem to point to the conclusion that it originated as a theological term in the school of Alexandria. See Dr. Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, Appendix A.

Digitized by Google

rest,' and we cannot bring ourselves to believe that it is what it pretends to be. In short, the fragments of this pseudo-Gospel, whatever be the external testimony to them, do not, when examined, bear out the claim that is made on their behalf, and, except where they borrow from the four Gospels, do not rise above the level of other Apocryphal documents of the age. It is by no means improbable that the compiler, whoever he may have been (certainly not one of the Apostles), may have had access to our present Gospel of S. Matthew, or to the traditional materials out of which it was composed, and it may be simply a *cento* out of these, made by some irresponsible person in every sense unauthorized, which shared the fate of such compositions, no doubt, in attracting to itself the legendary matter which was floating in the intellectual atmosphere during those ages.

It is a good thing, however, to do what Mr. Nicholson has done, i.e. examine with care and completeness the grounds upon which the shadowy form of a fifth Gospel is presented *in terrorem* before us; for it is curious that those who are rather inclined to depreciate the four Gospels are found to argue stoutly for the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews.' At all events it will not be Mr. Nicholson's fault if we do not know precisely what it is we are threatened with, and regard the spectre with great equanimity. This is certainly an acceptable service he has rendered to the Church. He says, frankly enough, that at least he has furnished to succeeding critics the armoury of facts wherewith, 'saving truth alive,' they are 'welcome to kill my theories.' And this is true; the facts are carefully and laboriously set out in the pages before us. He is very conscious that if a copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or of either of Jerome's translations of it [if it were really this he translated], should ever be recovered, 'my hypothesis might be blown to the winds.'

We think that the most has now been made of known facts; that the matter is of slight importance, and may be left to rest until such a 'find' has been made.

Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité. Par H. WALLON, Secrétaire Perpétuel de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres de Paris. 3 Vols. 8vo. (Paris and London: L. Hachette and Co., 1879.)

M. HENRI WALLON'S *History of Slavery in Antiquity*, published for the first time half a century ago, had long been out of print, and was fetching almost fabulous prices in book sales. A new edition, complete in three volumes, has recently appeared at Messrs. Hachette's, of Paris, and we are glad to have to notice a work which reflects the greatest credit upon the author's scholarship and Christian character. Although the *Histoire de l'Esclavage*, is, in its present form, notably enlarged, it cannot be said to be altered. Recent discoveries of an archæological nature have increased the facts quoted in the former edition, but they have not impaired the accuracy of M. Wallon's conclusions. He brings in new details to support his theories: the theories themselves remain what they were. Our readers will understand easily

Digitized by Google

that Egypt, Persia, and Assyria are the three countries respecting which our fund of information is chiefly enlarged. Greek and Latin authors had no doubt supplied us with curious details on their civilization and their social state; but what are these details compared with the mass of knowledge which granite, marble, stones, and bricks have revealed to us since forty years? Not only does the evidence contained in hieroglyphics and cuneiform inscriptions confirm what Herodotus, Strabo, and others had led us to believe; it sometimes helps us to correct the statements made by the Greek historians, and to refute what was till recently accepted as a popular tradition by students of ancient history. For instance, we used to be told that the Pharaohs were in the habit of putting to death their slaves for the purpose of offering human sacrifices to the deities of Egypt; this, however, is a mere idle tale which hieroglyphs entirely disprove. Then, again, the stamped bricks unearthed amongst the ruins of Nineveh and Persepolis, and which constituted the libraries of the old kings of Mesopotamia, have disclosed to us the nature and character of slave legislation in those distant climes and those remote ages. We may say that the servile code of the population which occupied the valley situated between the Tigris and the Euphrates is now comparatively well known to us, for the arrow-headed inscriptions have brought to light documents, such as deeds of sale and of exchange, and we have evidence sufficient to prove that the condition of slaves in Assyria and Babylonia was a great deal worse than in Egypt.

After examining the question of servitude in the East, M. Wallon directs our attention to Greece, and this part of the work is discussed with a fulness and completeness which make of it, so to say, a separate treatise. What was slavery at various times in the history of the Hellenic race, under the various *régimes* and in the different republics amongst which Greece was divided? It would be a mistake to suppose that serfdom was the same in Sparta and in Athens; the former of these cities made of slavery a question of national subjection, and the *Helots* represented a primitive population tied down, as such, by the relentless despotism of the conquerors. The Athenians, of a more gentle and refined nature, treated their slaves with greater moderation. After describing in detail the organization of the slave element in Athens and the Athenian colonies, M. Wallon examines what the greatest philosophers of antiquity thought respecting slavery. When we see men such as Aristotle and Plato defending a system which implies the degradation of human nature, we conclude that Christianity alone could see in it an institution of an essentially temporary character, and which was doomed to destruction sooner or later; hence the final proposition maintained by M. Wallon, to the effect that the religion of the Gospel, far from being merely a stage of progress in the history of human reason, was on almost all sides diametrically opposed to the principles and opinions of rationalism. The history of slavery at Rome, begun in the latter half of M. Wallon's second volume, occupies the whole of the third.

The author gives a complete description of slavery in the palmy days of the Roman Empire; he examines the relations which existed

Digitized by Google

between the slaves and (1) the patrons, and (2) the State; discussing, then, the question of freedmen, he states the various motives which led to the development of that intermediate class of persons; finally, he notes carefully the share contributed by slavery to the civilization of Rome and of the Latin world.

At the very time when the respective positions of serfs and masters seem thoroughly settled, and when the balance between the various elements of political and domestic society is to all appearance adjusted, *ne varietur*, a revolutionary movement originating in one of the obscurest and most insignificant provinces of the Empire comes with the avowed purpose of new-modelling the moral world, and the Gospel lays down with unmistakable clearness the true principles of liberty and equality. Such is the important topic considered by M. Wallon in the first chapter of his third volume. It was scarcely to be expected that the teaching of Our Lord as applied by the Apostles and the early Church would remain without influencing to a considerable extent the heathen philosophers of the day; and we need not admit the genuineness of Seneca's correspondence with S. Paul to show the possibility of the heathen philosopher's knowledge of Christianity. At any rate, we have here a subject worth discussing somewhat minutely; and, accordingly, our author explains the views which the leading Roman moralists held respecting slaves, showing, with much ingenuity, why, under the Empire, the theories put forth by Seneca and the Stoics must necessarily be the prevailing ones.

There is no doubt that before the accession of Constantine to the Imperial throne, modifications of a decidedly beneficial character were gradually introduced into the legislation of slavery. M. Wallon makes this quite clear by describing, first, what the original laws were, and, secondly, how new views came to be taken of the sources of slavery and the condition of slaves. Labour, the army, the various branches of the public service, municipal administration, the *familia urbana*, the *familia rustica*, the *coloni*, in fact, the whole framework of society, felt the influence of these reforms, which were so many concessions tacitly made to the spirit of Christianity. We must not forget, however, that the distress from which the Empire was suffering during the last stage of its existence had compelled the State to curtail the rights of the masters over their slaves, and thus the reforms we are now referring to were far from being altogether of a disinterested character. As M. Wallon very aptly remarks —'The abolition of slavery could be brought about only by a stronger and juster power, inaccessible both to the variations of politics and to the vicissitudes of time, and taking its position as the substratum of natural law and of the divine sanction of that law. To Christianity was reserved the noble task of realizing here below the work of universal freedom.'

The last chapter of the *Histoire de l'Esclavage* is entirely taken up by an account of slavery in the Christian Church, a detailed statement of the opinions entertained by the Fathers, and a description of the means which the Church employed, and the efforts it strenu-

Digitized by Google

ously made, to eradicate an institution equally unjustifiable in its principle and demoralizing in its results. We see the laws of Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian steadily introducing reforms of every kind; the liberation of the slaves is facilitated; the cruelties of the amphitheatre are suppressed, and in the Lower Empire the progress attained, thanks to the persevering efforts of the Church, affects not only the slaves, but domesticity of every kind, and even the class of small landholders. M. Wallon thus takes us as far as the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, and terminates his excellent work by an eloquent appeal to the communities which, even at the present day, countenance slavery as a political institution and find arguments in support of its so-called advantages. A hundred pages of illustrative notes, and a copious analytical index to the whole work complete the third volume, adding much to its value.

A Beleaguered City. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1880.)

WE have seldom read a more striking or suggestive tale than this one. It was evidently suggested by Longfellow's poem:—

I have read in some old marvellous tale
Some legend strange and vague,
That a midnight host of spectres pale
Beleaguered the walls of Prague.

Beside the Moldau's rushing stream
With the wan moon overhead,
There stood as in an awful dream
The army of the dead.

* * * * *

But when the old Cathedral bell
Proclaimed the morning prayer,
The white pavilions rose and fell
On the alarmèd air.

Down the broad valley fast and far
The troubled army fled,
Up rose the glorious morning star,
The ghastly host was dead.

These verses and the sacred sentence which concludes the history of Dives and Lazarus are the keynotes to the story Mrs. Oliphant has told us, but not as a 'legend strange and vague,' nor in so remote a region as Prague. The place is a town in modern France, the narrator an extremely modern *Maire*, who has adopted the fashionable scepticism, while keeping up as much of external observance as may become his office and silence his wife and mother. Two or three acts of irreverence and fraud among the townspeople have led to the exclamation: 'It is enough to make the dead rise from their graves.' A strange greyness gradually comes over everything; it is the middle of July, the barometer is high, yet the light is gradually obscured, and outside the walls there is a wonderful oppressive sense of being in a

Digitized by Google

throng, although nothing is visible. M. le Maire, who has gone out to investigate, is overpowered with awe, and faints as he returns, though, as he says, 'A man of resolution may give way to the overpowering sensations of the moment. His bodily faculties may fail him, but his mind will not fail. As in every really superior intelligence, my forces were collected for the emergency.' It is this truly national conceit of official dignity that renders the Maire's narrative specially real and impressive.

The morning comes; the clocks strike, but all is still in twilight gloom. No other sound is to be heard; the terrified people at length bestir themselves, and turn towards the cathedral. The great doors are closed, and on them is an awful placard, in letters of light, headed *Sommation.* Beneath each man or woman reads his or her own name, and the words: 'Go! leave this place to us who know the true signification of life.'

The general belief is that a judgment has been brought on the place by the bricking up of a window in the hospital, through which the patients had been used to hear mass. The Maire had yielded to the spirit of the age in spite of the remonstrances of the nursing Sisters and the Curé. And now he is convinced that it is a trick, reproaches the Curé, who utterly denies all knowledge of it, and sends for the man of science, who is sure that there is an explanation, but fails to find it, and is as awe-stricken as the rest.

Next, an irresistible power gradually makes each person leave the town. All, whether they will or no, are walking along the street and out at the gates, while the bells toll as for a funeral. The gates shut behind them; they are in the open country with the sun shining in clear brightness, only a dark cloud blotting out the city. Most of them are full of terror, but there are some who only feel infinite peace and even delight. Among these is the Maire's own gentle wife, who has felt absolute contact with her little girl, dead some years since, while others have seen a mother, a babe, a son killed in Africa. Some of these, in particular Madame Dupin, the Maire's wife, receive a communication that the 'little ones are not to suffer,' and the ladies lead the women and children to La Clairière, a small estate of the Maire's, where they receive shelter while he and the men bivouack outside the walls. There are fearful undefined sights and sounds, ringing of bells, jubilant at first, then sad, and the sweet wife tries in vain to persuade her husband that this awful mission is meant to make them submit their hearts to the unseen. At last from the gates comes forth one person, bowed and broken, a man previously good and pious, who had been left behind there, 'three days'—he said wondering, 'I should have said years. Time is long where there is neither night nor day.' He bears a message, 'not from the dead, but the immortal,' to ask 'Do ye know now—?' Vows and promises of all sorts are made: 'The churches shall be full, the hospital window shall be opened, masses shall be said, never will we forget holy functions, we will vow ourselves to the holy Mother and the Saints.' It then appears that two are to be sent to speak with the strange occupants of the city face to face: the Maire and the Curé were the two.

Digitized by Google

Would that we could give the full beautiful narrative of the faces that this solitary man had seen, and the voices he had heard, yearning over those who could not be brought to understand or believe, or only in a childish surface way. Time and space warn us to cease, and leave our readers to study for themselves this most striking book with its grave lesson. Perhaps the most notable portion of all is the result, when the supernatural visitation had passed away, and common life has begun again: showing how the faithful may perhaps have been deepened in faith, but how with the rest the impression was only skin deep, producing shallow external observances which soon are dropped, and how, in the case of the Maire himself, a little vulgar exaggeration and miracle-mongering ruined the beneficial effect of the dispensation. The whole seems to us a great poem well worthy to be remembered and dwelt upon, and except for the profuse use of French expletives the style is suited to the high tone of the thought.

How to work with the Microscope. By LIONEL S. BEALE, F.R.S., President of the Microscopical Society. Fifth edition. (London: Harrison, 1880.)

THE fourth edition of this work appeared in 1867. The present edition has been 'revised throughout and much enlarged.' The art of printing in colours, which has been so much developed of late years, has contributed much to enhance the value of a work already very meritorious for the labour and skill employed in its compilation and the accuracy of its delineations. The book now contains 'one hundred plates, comprising more than six hundred engravings, some printed in colours.'

Here the student who desires to see with his own eyes the marvellous structure of the almost 'infinitely little' will find full directions as to the means to be pursued. Here are clear descriptions of microscopic appliances, instructions as to preparation of 'objects,' how to obtain sections of tissues, &c., adapted for microscopical inspection, how to inject fluids, coloured or not, into the tissues so as to render their structure distinguishable, besides cautions and instructions as to the various methods of examining the objects when they have been duly prepared. One need not however be a practical microscopist in order to find this book both instructive and interesting. It is not every one who has the time, the patience or inclination, or the skill in manipulation for working with the microscope. With the aid, however, of Dr. Beale's plates and descriptions, a knowledge of many of the wonders revealed by it may be obtained, only second to that which may be gained from the same source by one who has the magnified objects before him: especially if occasional recourse be had to realities resembling those pictured in this work.

It is well known that Dr. Beale, like some of the most eminent physiologists of France (*e.g.* the late Claude Bernard) rejects that εἴδωλον 'of the den,' so much in vogue amongst the English materialists, which would regard all vital phenomena as merely special cases of the operation of physical forces, and thus degrade living

Digitized by Google

beings into machines. Claude Bernard points out the error of confounding the *causes* of phenomena with their *conditions*. Vital phenomena, intellectual functions included, are subject to physico-chemical conditions. If, after transfusion of blood, intelligence returns into a brain, or into a countenance, to which has been restored the element which they needed in order to perform their functions (*pour fonctionner*), we shall be wrong in concluding that the intelligence is in the blood or in the cerebral matter.[1] Dr. Beale is equally decided against the physico-chemical theory. He says (pp. 397, 398) :—

'The formation of the various structures and peculiar characteristic substances in living beings can only be explained if the operation of some force or power of a different order, and belonging to a different category, from all other forces or powers influencing non-living matter, be postulated. . . . The *vital* processes of *growth, formation*, and *multiplication* are peculiar to living beings. . . . To this day not one single vital action has been explained or accounted for, or imitated in any form of non-living matter.'

Growth, formation, and multiplication, are adduced by the French authority also as inexplicable by purely physical forces. But Dr. Beale's microscopical research has enabled him, as it appears, to trace more into minute detail the operation of that vital force, which according to him enables living matter or 'bioplasm' to unite with and convert into bioplasm non-living matter, and so provide the substance of tissue.

A Popular Guide to the Terms of Art and Science. By C. Bankes Brookes. (Philadelphia : Lippincott and Co., 1879.)

We should have been happy to welcome this visitor from 'over the sea' if it had been possible. Its object is to guide the non-professional or non-scientific person to the technical terms for popular words, and *vice versâ*, to the popular language for technical terms; but it would be found a very unsatisfactory guide. By way of testing its completeness we looked in the index for the first half-dozen scientific words that suggested themselves, viz., aneurism, capillarity, centrifugal, centripetal, endosmose, protoplasm, and found none of them. But room is granted to the pseudo-scientific word, Electro-Biology, and to its explanation, 'The science of *electrical forces* as shown in mesmerism.' Diamagnetism is explained to be 'The science which treats of *diamagnetic phenomena*, and of the properties of diamagnetic bodies:' which reminds one of the well-known description of the duties of an archdeacon. Derivation is treated upon no fixed principle, sometimes given, sometimes not. But, in fine, what is to be expected from a writer who in his preface describes the service which his book will render, 'if one should happen upon' an unfamiliar term and desire to learn its meaning?

[1] *Rapport sur les progrès et la marche de la Physiologie Générale en France*, par M. Claude Bernard, Membre de l'Institut, &c. Paris, 1867.

Digitized by Google

1. *Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in* 1871. By HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)
2. *The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play.* By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)

THE Passion Play of *Ober-Ammergau* is to be performed again in the coming autumn, and the two little books before us are seasonable reprints of descriptions of the last performance of this sacred drama in 1871. They will be welcome to others besides those who propose, and are able, to visit *Ober-Ammergau* in 1880. Mr. MacColl's volume is a reprint of his vivid letters to the *Times*. He has prefixed some introductory remarks on the origin and development of Miracle Plays, and also some useful practical hints as to the best way of reaching *Ober-Ammergau*, as to hotels and carriages, and even as to opera-glasses. Mr. Oxenham's book is a revised edition of his description of the Passionsspiel communicated to the pages of the *Guardian*. Both these volumes are excellent of their kind. Happily we are not obliged to place them in an order of merit.

A Diocesan Map of England and Wales. By the Rev. DONALD J. MACKEY. (Edinburgh and London: W. and A. K. Johnston, 1880.)

THIS is a very valuable map, 23 by 18 inches in size, intended to show to the eye the provisions of the Bishoprics Act of 1878, and also the recommendations of the Cathedral Commissioners of 1854. The dioceses, old and new, are bounded by red lines. The names and limits of the counties are given, and the population, both of counties and dioceses, according to the census of 1871, is clearly marked. Besides these particulars, the map shows the acreage of each diocese and the number of its parishes, and a table adds the number of archdeaconries and rural deaneries contained in each. Further, the cathedrals and the residences of the bishops are indicated, and also the towns in which Church Congresses have been held. We think that county towns might usefully have been added; and also the chief lines of railway. The map is very suggestive, both as showing what subdivision of dioceses has already been decided upon, and what further rearrangement is needed. The absurdity of the present limits of the Diocese of Rochester can only be adequately understood when they are seen projected on a map.

Lenten and other Sermons. By HENRY W. BURROWS, B.D., Prebendary of S. Paul's, Vicar of Edmonton. (London: W. Wells Gardner, 1880.)

A SMALL volume of eighteen sermons, of which only six are for Lent, but of which all exemplify the usual merits of the esteemed author. The sermon on the 'churlish' Nabal takes our fancy most. It is quaint and plain spoken, and reads a wholesome lesson to those who will not 'bear to be spoken to.' We do not remember ever seeing a sermon on this subject before.

Digitized by Google

Via Crucis. Fourteen Sermons on the Passion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, forming a series of Meditations for Lent and Holy Week. By the Rev. SAMUEL J. EALES, M.A., Principal of the Mission College, Warminster. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1880.)

MR. EALES deserves credit for the happy suggestion of using the so-called 'Stations of the Cross' as the subjects of a series of short addresses, or meditations, on the Passion. The service of the Three Hours' Agony is by this time familiar to most of us. It is doubtless a very impressive act of worship, and the seven addresses on the Last Words from the Cross may be made, in the hands of a master, most touching and instructive. But it may be doubted whether these devotions do not impose a rather severe tax on the energies both of preachers and hearers, especially in churches where the authorized Prayer-Book Services for Good Friday are not superseded, but used in addition. Besides which, seven dull and poor sermons in succession—and *some* sermons are dull and poor—must be a trial of patience to many minds. Anyhow, there is a novelty in Mr. Eales' idea of extending a course of meditations on the Passion over the fourteen Stations of the well-known *Via Crucis.* And we think this little book will give many valuable suggestions to hard-worked parish priests for their Lent sermons. The three separate Falls of our Blessed Lord under the weight of the Cross, the meeting between Him and the Blessed Virgin Mother in the *Via Dolorosa,* and the beautiful legend of the Veronica, are not strictly scriptural. But there can be no reasonable doubt that the Divine Sufferer must have fallen to the ground, under His Cross, before Simon of Cyrene was compelled to bear it in His stead. Nor can any one who knows anything of a mother's love refuse to believe that the Blessed Virgin, who stood (as the Evangelists record) by the foot of the Cross, must have accompanied the sad procession to Calvary, and may well have spoken to her Son at some point or other of the way. Mr. Eales treats the episode of S. Veronica with much delicacy and discernment as a parable on the power of sympathy, and gives the imaginary incident a place in his series rather for the sake of completeness, and for use in private meditation, than as a topic for a public sermon. This little volume is characterized by a fervent piety and prevailing soberness of religious thought, and we can warmly recommend it as a storehouse of useful ideas for Lent preachers.

The Communion of the Sick. Sixth Edition. (Warwick : H. T. Cooke and Son. London : R. and A. Suttaby, 1879.)

THESE Office books have the advantage of being so light that they can be held, or laid open, by a sick person ; and by a simple device of red lines, and brief directions to stand or kneel, some accidents which often attend clinical communions are remedied. To attribute the words *Therefore with Angels . . . praising Thee and saying,* to the people's part, in deference to the common printers' blunder, is surely a serious liturgical error.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XX. *JULY* 1880.

ART. I.—CASSIODORUS.

1. *Patrologia Latina.* Edente MIGNE, tom. LXIX.–LXX. *Cassiodori Opera.* (Paris, 1865.)
2. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.* Art. *Cassiodorus.* By Professor RAMSEY. (London, 1865.)
3. *Dictionary of Christian Biography.* Art. *Cassiodorus.* By Rev. E. M. YOUNG. (London, 1877.)

THE great revolutions of the fifth and sixth centuries which broke up the Roman Empire were very various in their violence and forms of change. Our knowledge of the Northern races or nations who conquered and settled, and who to the Roman world were all alike barbarians, is at best imperfect and vague; but we know enough to perceive that the differences between them were as great then as those which mark the several nations which now occupy their old seats in the north of Europe. The German Franks, who broke into Gaul, or the German Vandals, who conquered Africa, were fiercer, coarser, more uncompromising races than the Goths, who won for a moment the great prize of Italy itself, and seemed likely at one time to make of it a new and great kingdom. In the neighbourhood of Byzantium, the new Rome, in frequent intercourse with it, and often in its service, the Goths had come to know something of its strength and weakness, they had learned something of its statecraft and its religion. Theodoric's conquest of Italy was something very different from the contemporaneous Frank conquest of Gaul. Clovis and his North Germans, after they had spoiled and ruined, only thought of living as they had been accustomed to live, but in greater

Digitized by Google

and freer abundance of all that makes barbarian enjoyment; and after they had conquered and partitioned the Catholic Provincials, they were only too glad to find in the propagation of the Catholic faith a pretext for indulging their insatiate love of fighting at the expense of the Arian Goths of Southern Gaul. But Theodoric aimed at founding a state, in which all that the great Romans had invented and used to strengthen and order it should be preserved and made available for the benefit and the improvement of the new masters of Italy. It was necessarily a military state, which means under all disguises a ruling and a subject population; but it was his definite purpose and object that the signs of this should be visible as little as possible on the surface of things, and should in the course of time actually disappear in the gradual fusion and union of the two races, Gothic and Italian; and this purpose might perhaps, if he had left a line of successors like himself, have been more than a dream.

As it was, events were hopelessly against him. The daughter and grandson whom he left were swept away and perished by their own weakness and folly, and the Gothic chiefs who took his place were no match for the power of Justinian and the genius of Belisarius. What Theodoric had built up with so much care and intelligence, and invested with such promise of order and stability, vanished utterly; nothing remained of it but the palace and tomb of its founder at Ravenna, and the echoes of the renown of the Teutonic hero of Verona, 'Dietrich of Bern,' in the legends of distant Germany. But in its short time of life his reign seemed like a great and successful experiment, by which the new was to be welded with the old. It seemed as if the barbarian intruders, who had caused so much mischief and even greater terror, had voluntarily and spontaneously shown a desire for improvement, and a disposition to submit to the taming and widening discipline of Italian civil order.[1]

The general character and policy of Theodoric's kingdom,

[1] The important period of the barbarian settlements in Italy has been studied with their usual care by the Germans—Von Savigny, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts;* Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte;* Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen;* Hegel, *Geschichte der Städteverfassung von Italien.* Dahn has exhibited his conceptions of the state of things which led to the overthrow of Theodoric's great attempt in a historical novel, *Ein Kampf um Rom,* which is spoiled by unfair prejudice against the Italians. English readers may look forward to a special history of this time from Mr. Thomas Hodgkin, whose first two volumes, *Italy and her Invaders,* coming down to Odoacer, which have recently appeared, promise a very interesting treatment of the Gothic and Lombard periods.

Digitized by Google

which, as Montesquieu[1] observed, was entirely different from the plan of all the other barbarian kingdoms, is sufficiently known from the account which Jordanes has abridged from the great historical work of Cassiodorus, from the notices of the shrewd and well-informed Greek observer, Procopius, and from the collection of legal and administrative rules which goes by the name of Theodoric's 'Edict,' and which embodies the principles and spirit of his policy. But in the case of this remarkable attempt of political sagacity in one of the new race of conquerors we have something more than a general character. We have a great mass of State papers which exhibit in detail the working out of the scheme of government conceived by the Gothic king,[2]—the *Variæ*, or 'Miscellaneous Letters,' of Cassiodorus. These letters are not, indeed, as interesting as they would have been if they had been written or dictated by Theodoric himself; if any part of the collection had been preserved in his own familiar mother speech, the noble Gothic tongue, which, except in the precious remains of Ulfilas's version of the Scriptures and a few unimportant fragments picked up by chance, has perished from the earth alike in Italy and Spain, where it was once the language of rulers; or even if his orders had been expressed in the rude army Latin, the dialect of the camp, which was probably the only Latin or Italian which Theodoric could speak. The letters are not of his own composition: these orders, despatches, instructions, are the work of his Italian secretary; and if anything is certain, it is that assuredly Theodoric would not himself have written as the zealous and accomplished gentleman and rhetorician wrote, to whom he gave his commands, and who transmitted them in his own form to the officials for whom they were meant. The contrast must have been remarkable in the intercourse of business or amusement, one cannot but suppose, between the great German king, who could not write his name, and had not much respect for mere literary education, but was full of large and bold ideas on the subject of

[1] *Esprit des Lois*, xxx. c. 12.

[2] Cf. Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, iii., appendix 1, p. 14. After saying that Theodoric's *Edict* proceeded from that which pervaded his whole government, his care for *civilitas*, the repression of violence either from Goths against Romans or of great men against the weaker free population, Dahn observes: '*Die Variensammlung ist überhaupt der Schlüssel zum Edict:* sie ist ein umfassender Spiegel der Zeit; sie zeigt uns jene Verhältnisse in lebendiger Bewegung, deren Ordnung das Gesetz bezweckt; dieses reiche Material aus gleichzeitiger Praxis gewährt die wichtigste Ergänzung und die richtigste Erklärung des dürftigen, und wenn isolirt betrachtet, unverständlichen Edict.'

Digitized by Google

governing Italy, and his ready and useful secretary, Catholic and Roman to the core, yet loyal to the service which he had embraced, brimful of curious and rather idle erudition, and inexhaustible in florid combinations of verbiage which the fashion of the time took for eloquence. If three-fourths of what we have written by Cassiodorus in the twelve books of his *Variæ* were blotted out, we should still have all, or probably more than all, which really shows the working of the administration of which he was the mouthpiece and organ. But in those dim days we must not complain of the form in which information otherwise unattainable, and more than we could have hoped for, is preserved for our use.

Cassiodorus was a remarkable person. We must take all men with what they have of their times; the fashions which their times impose on them, the dwarfing, the distortion, the limitations, the shaping and moulding, which the general circumstances of their time cause in all who are born to grow up and live among them. He was born in an age when civilization had run to seed, when it had been broken into by barbarian force, when great disasters and great moral corruption had eaten out vitality and strength from the still prized forms of public service and individual thought. He was all over a man in bondage to the limitations and false standards and measures of the sixth century; but he was a man of Italian activity, perseverance, and resource of mind. He had gone through a great deal of reading, and had practised diligently the application of what he had stored up of knowledge or hearsay information. He was a man, in an infinitely lower degree of course, with the encyclopædic culture of Cicero or the elder Pliny; a state official or a public servant first, but then also a man of letters, a logician, a natural philosopher, a moralist, a divine, a student and lover of art and nature. Without any of that genius which sometimes, even under disadvantageous conditions and in rude and imperfect forms, breaks through the monotony of a degenerate and barren age, he was a man eminently useful to his generation and to those which succeeded it. He did his best for his time, and in the way and measure in which only it could derive advantage from his activity. He began with being an industrious and, as far as appears, public-spirited and upright administrator. Then in his days of leisure he compiled and digested the learning and wisdom of better times for the use of his poorly educated contemporaries. He was a great collector of books, and earnestly encouraged their transcription and multiplication. He popularized grammar and the

Digitized by Google

'liberal' sciences, as far as they survived in the schools of the day. He wrote a popular introduction to the study of Scripture. He compiled a popular ecclesiastical history of the great dogmatic struggles of the fourth and fifth centuries, the *Historia Tripartita*, from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which became the historical text-book of the Middle Ages. And he put together, mainly from S. Augustine, an elaborate commentary on the Book of Psalms, which conveyed the ideas and the manner of the great teacher to many who might not find it easy to get access to or to use the original works, from which Cassiodorus extracted and selected. Nor was his industry confined to theology. Besides the collection of his State papers, of which more will be said, he was the author of a work which, if it had survived, would have been counted next in interest to the *Germania* of Tacitus—a history of the Goths in twelve books. We know it only from the abridgment of it by Jornandes, or, as he is now called, Jordanes. But though we know enough of Cassiodorus to know that his work would be diffuse and uncritical, yet Theodoric's secretary and familiar friend must have had opportunities, and the disposition to use them, of learning the legends and traditions of the Goths such as no other Roman of the time could have had; and we cannot doubt that even in the very uncongenial and unsuitable dress of Latin rhetoric enough of their outlines and features would have appeared to show us something of the distant and dim past of that remarkable race of which the language of Ulfilas's Gospels is now almost the only thing to tell what manner of men they were.

Cassiodorus was born just when the line of the Western Emperors was coming to a close in the boy who was named in derision Romulus Augustulus (476), and who was so insignificant as to be spared by the barbarian conqueror for a life of luxury on the shores of Campania. The glory of Western Rome was quenched for many a long year, and Italy had finally come down to be the appointed prey and heritage of the stranger. This was the Italy into which Cassiodorus was born,[1] and in such an Italy his long life was spent. He saw in his youth the Gothic kingdom begin under the great Theodoric (493), whose servant he early became, and whom he served to the end; he saw it over-

[1] Clinton gives 480 as the year of his birth. The Benedictine editor places it nine or ten years earlier, in 469, or 470. The earlier date is probably the true one; but there is some confusion between the different Cassiodori.

Digitized by Google

thrown, not by Italians, but by other strangers, the Moorish, Isaurian, and Hunnish bands, whom barbarian generals, Belisarius and Narses, led to victory in the service of the Greek Empire; and he probably lived to see the next change, the coming in of the new masters, the Lombards (568). In his ninety-third year, as he himself has recorded, he was writing a treatise on orthography for the use of the monks of the monastery near Squillace, in which he passed his later years, and which he made a place of study, manuscript copying, and even of physical experiments. The date given by Clinton for his death—575—cannot be far wrong. His father and his grandfather before him had filled public offices;[1] and his father had been one of those Italians who, in the confusion of the time, with all the old authority of the Imperial government overthrown, with the ancient military system of Rome utterly shattered and its spirit departed, with nothing to represent the traditions of the great commonwealth but the pretensions and conspiracies of feeble upstarts and mock emperors who were the nominees of the Barbarians, thought it the wisest thing, as well as the safest, to offer their experience and their skill to the service of those among the German chiefs who seemed most likely to be masters in Italy. The elder Cassiodorus had served Odoacer in an administrative capacity, and is said to have served him loyally and well. Then, when Odoacer fell before the power of Theodoric, he continued, with the same faithfulness and from the same motives, to serve Theodoric. He brought his son into the same service. The son was an apt pupil and learned his lesson well. At a critical moment he deserved the gratitude of the new ruler by securing to his allegiance Sicily and the southern provinces of Italy, Apulia and Bruttium.[2] He rose through the grades of the official hierarchy to the consulship and to be Prætorian Prefect at Rome. But his public life was one of much more than mere routine. The Gothic king, with his political ideas and aims, was yet as little at home in his Italian kingdom as the first Englishmen were in India. He could crush and punish; but he knew that he lived among one set of thoughts and interests and the Italians in another, and what was necessary for his policy was not fear only, but confidence, goodwill, attachment. Ac-

[1] V. Clinton, *Fasti Rom.* a. 493.

[2] *Var.* i. 3, 4. Clinton refers this to the father (*F. R.* 493); but the matter is not clear. It depends on the question whether the son was ever 'Patrician.' See the Preface to his Collection. In this, he certainly does not mention the Patriciat in the list of his own dignities.

Digitized by Google

cordingly he attempted to use Italians in order to conciliate, to manage, to protect, to govern Italians. He thus employed Boethius and Symmachus. Apparently with still greater confidence he thus employed the younger Cassiodorus. Cassiodorus was his secretary, from whom he sought information and counsel, and by whom his orders and instructions were interpreted and transmitted to the Italian civil authorities and sometimes to Gothic ones. The position of Cassiodorus was very much like that of an Italian minister in the service of a benevolent Austrian viceroy or governor of Lombardy; he was such a man, both in his usefulness and in his obsequiousness, as the Lombard nobles, Beccaria, and Cristiani, and Pallavicini, and Verri, who served Maria Theresa and Joseph II. at Milan.

In his days of leisure, when he had retired to his monastery in Bruttium, after escaping the storms which swept away his and his master's work in Italy, and in which Boethius perished and the Gothic kingdom was wrecked, the energetic old man, among his other literary employments, collected, at the request of his friends, he says, as many as he could find of his despatches and State papers, and arranged them in twelve books. It had been a way with Romans, ever since Cicero set the fashion, to collect and publish their letters, if they had been engaged in affairs or if they thought they could write well; and the habit continued through the early and middle ages to later days. The examples of Pliny, of Cyprian, of Augustine, of Jerome, were followed in this age by Sidonius, the elder Symmachus, and Ennodius; the widespread business of the Popes and the growing importance of their letters made a regular 'Regestum' and an establishment of clerks and transcribers a matter of course at Rome; and the great collection of the letters of Gregory the Great attested its industry and its businesslike method. With such precedents, almost every man in a prominent place made it his duty to preserve his own letters. They were not always worth keeping for the reasons for which they were kept. But this is a department of literature in which the self-complacency of authorship has incidentally done great service to knowledge. Letters are the great checks on professed and studied narratives. They give the aspect of transactions as they appeared at the moment and on the spot, either to the actors or to bystanders looking on. And they preserve and exhibit often in full work institutions and arrangements of which otherwise no record is kept, because they are known to every one and are part of every one's daily life. The

Digitized by Google

Collection of Cassiodorus, the most extensive yet made in the later times of Rome, is the only thing which gives us anything like a detailed and real picture of the beginnings of that long servitude of Italy to the 'barbarian,' which, once begun, continued almost to the present day. We may pardon a good deal—and there is a good deal to pardon—in so authentic and so indispensable an informant.

The characteristic weaknesses of Cassiodorus come out in the account which he gives of the origin of this collection. He was exceedingly vain of his learning, his rhetorical abundance and richness, and his skill and tact in affairs. But he followed the fashion of ostentatious self-depreciation, and he presents this monument of his labours in the public service with a transparent and amusing air of mock modesty. His accomplished friends, he says in the Preface to his letters, pressed him to collect into one work all that he had from time to time in his numerous and important offices put forth for the purpose of throwing light on public business or expediting it; posterity, they said, ought to know all the toil and trouble he had gone through in the public service, and would be glad of such knowledge. He doubts. Posterity, he thinks, is more likely to think differently from his too partial friends, and to find his papers very dry and uninteresting; and, besides, they are so hurriedly and rudely written. His friends ought to remember the circumstances under which they were composed; the impatience of applicants waiting attention; the answers which had to be written on the spur of the moment and could not be recalled or amended. The great masters of style bid you keep your compositions till the ninth year, and he had not an hour to think of the proprieties of composition; as soon as he began to write, the noise and hurry round him made it impossible to write with care.

'One man,' he says, 'overwhelms me with a stream of captious questions; another worries me with the burden of his distresses; others compass me about with furious and mutinous demands. And then you ask for fine writing and style! Why, I have hardly time to find the plainest words for my meaning. All my nights are haunted by endless anxieties lest food should fail in the towns, where people care a great deal more for what satisfies their bellies than what pleases their ears; further, we have to move about the provinces and see how our orders are obeyed, for it will not do with military people to issue commands unless there are civil authorities to see them carried out. Please do not love me so unkindly as to press me to publish.'

Digitized by Google

And then come all the answers—they are his own reasons for the publication; the high stations he had filled, up to that of Prætorian Prefect; the concentration in one hand of all public business (the pay of the army, the sustenance of the population, the administration of justice); his whole time devoted, without interruption, to the public good; his high character for stainless integrity and hereditary virtue; the confidence and familiarity of great princes; the power, so rare a possession, of producing, amid such occupations, anything that was valuable for readers; the great use to others of his State papers, as precedents and models; finally, the opportunity of doing due honour to the distinguished personages to whom his letters were addressed, or of whom they made mention. 'You restrain vice by your authority,' he supposes his friends to say to him; 'you crush the audacity of the transgressor; you restore its terrors to the law: and yet you doubt about publishing what must conduce to such great ends. You hide, so to speak, the mirror which reflects your mind from the view of posterity.'

He yielded, he tells us, to the representations of his friends, and collected his letters for public reading. But it is amusing, when we come to the letters, to find the form into which he has cast these State papers and despatches. He deprecates criticism for the *agrestis sermo* into which hurry and pressure of business forced him; he had no time to choose words and discriminate meanings. He apologizes for hasty and unpolished phrases; he also has had to adapt his style to occasions, and the fastidious may even find fault with what is to his credit, that in addressing inferior persons he has suited his speech to their capacity or their importance But how shall the real style of the letters be described? There used to be, and probably still is, in Italy, a class of persons found there only, called *improvisatori.* Give these persons a subject of whatever kind, and forthwith they start off without hesitation or pause into a poetical composition about it, pouring forth an uninterrupted flow of words, allusions, figures, usually of a very commonplace kind, but with an affluence which is amazing and seems inexhaustible. Except that Cassiodorus writes prose and not verse, this is the kind of impression which his letters produce. They are State papers put into the hand of an *improvisatore* to throw into form, and composed with his luxuriant verbiage, and also with his coarse taste. The shortest instructions begin with an aphorism or an epigram. If they are more important or lengthy, they sparkle and flash with conceits and antitheses,

Digitized by Google

and every scrap of learning, every bit of science or natural history, every far-fetched coincidence which may start up in the writer's memory, however remote in its bearing on the subject, is dragged in to exalt or illustrate it, though the subject itself may be of the plainest and most matter-of-fact kind. You read through a number of elaborate sentences, often tumid and pompous, sometimes felicitous and pointed, but all of the most general and abstract sort; and, nestling in the thick of them, towards the end of the letter or paper, you come upon the order, or instruction, or notification, for which the letter or paper is written, almost smothered and lost in the abundance of ornament round it. They show what the Latin schools had come to towards the close of the Empire. It is exactly analogous to the flabby degeneration which came on the Italian language on the final extinction of Italian liberties under the foreign masters, Spanish and German, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

But though the form be so bad, the substance deserves a different judgment. They are the letters of a man who was doing his best to uphold justice, to protect the oppressed, to curb the lawless, and to secure as much quiet and happiness to his country and his people as under the hard conditions of the time could be assured to them. It was not a time when an Italian could speak of liberty and greatness in the old tones. It was not a time when, if he was wise, he would dream of striking a blow for independence, or of attempting to call forth the temper and strength of ancient Rome in generations which had such a history of irretrievable and fixed decay. Vengeance had come to the uttermost on the guilty 'Lady of Kingdoms.' 'She that was great among the nations and princess among the provinces—she was become tributary;' and Italy lay, an exhausted and paralysed body, incapable of raising an arm in her own cause, condemned to see whatever victories were won on her own soil used, not for herself, but for the profit of the strangers who fought for her possession, Greek or German. She was condemned for her monstrous sins, and this was her hour of punishment. None of her sons could hope to deliver her out of the hand of the nations round her, to whom the strength of the world had passed. She had not in her population the materials for a national army to assert her independence against the East and North, against the discipline and resources of Byzantium, against the manliness and massive strength and enthusiasm for war of the German tribes. She had lost the traditions of soldiership; there was no bond of

Digitized by Google

union and reciprocal trust; it was idle to hope that her conquerors would give time to raise and organize an Italian force for Italian purposes. Anyhow, there was no one to do it. Her noblest children only thought how they might mitigate the tyranny and relieve the sufferings which they could not prevent. Boethius, when he recollects what he had suffered in his love for Italy, has no visions of freedom, no words about breaking the yoke off her neck.[1] He only recounts what he had done in the cause of justice and mercy, as the minister and magistrate of her Gothic master. He had brought on himself the enmity of the bad, and had offended the powerful by standing up for right. He had withstood Conigast in his assaults on the fortunes of the weak; he had resisted the barbaric avarice of the King's chamberlain, Triggvilla; he had rescued Paulinus from the jaws of the 'dogs of the palace,' who were thirsting for his blood and his possessions. He had maintained the claims and honour of the Senate. But Boethius, in opening his heart to Philosophy, the Consoler, breathes not a word to show that he had ever thought, as an Italian patriot, of delivering Italy from her conquerors. Indeed, he disclaims it. He makes a merit of loyal service to the Goths, not of efforts and hopes for the enfranchisement of Italy.

The first letter in the collection of Cassiodorus shows the character which, between them, Theodoric and his Italian secretary desired to give to the German conquest of Italy. It is a letter addressed to the Greek Emperor, Anastasius, sent with an embassy commissioned to arrange some differences which threatened peace. It assumes that the Roman Empire is intact, and that the Roman Emperor is unique in his greatness and dignity among the rulers of the earth; and, without for a moment or by a single word compromising his own independence, Theodoric is made by his secretary to claim a Roman dignity for his crown, and to feel it his highest honour to govern Romans in concert and harmony with the Empire and after the emperors' example. It was a position like that adopted by the great bishops of Africa or Alexandria towards the Roman See; any amount of honour for it, but not a jot of their own independence conceded in the acknowledgment.

'You are the fairest beauty of all kingdoms, you are the shield and safeguard of the world, which other rulers acknowledge because they recognize in you something peerless, and we especially, who, by God's help, have learned in your commonwealth how to rule over

[1] Boet. *Phil. Consol.* i. 4.

Digitized by Google

Romans with equity. Our rule is modelled on yours, the transcript of a good design, the copy of an empire which has no fellow. Just in proportion as we follow you we are before all other nations. You urge me to cherish the Senate, to embrace with favour the imperial laws, to bind together all the interests of Italy. How can you exclude from your august peace him whom you would not wish to see alienated from your ways? And there is besides the tie of reverence which binds you to the city of Rome, which they cannot break who have joined themselves in the unity of that name. . . . We cannot think that you will allow that between the two states (*respublicæ*), which, as it is clear, under the former princes always formed one body, any discord can be permanent. They ought not only to be connected by a barren amity, but to be mutually assisted by each other's power. In the Roman kingdom let there be but one will, but one sentiment. Whatever we can do shall be at the service of your commands.'[1]

The collection of letters and State papers composed by Cassiodorus in the name of Theodoric supply in numberless and varied forms the commentary on this: that is, they exhibit the effort to continue under the new and foreign rule the customary and traditional administration of Roman experience and of Roman civilized government. Forms and machinery are preserved. All the framework of the official hierarchy is kept, and exhibited in the *Formulæ* or commissions composed by Cassiodorus. Consulars and Patricians and Prætorian Præfects and Quæstors—very different from their republican namesakes—Counts of the first order and the second, all are as carefully distinguished as in the *Notitia* itself, or in the order of a modern court and administration; and, further, the arrangements and regulations of the Roman finance and revenue system are all continued. There is, of course, the plain fact which no fictions or accommodations could get rid of or disguise, that Italy, with its lands and populations, had changed masters; and that its masters, in the last resort, whether they are moderate and reasonable masters, or cruel and greedy ones, were Goths and conquerors. But there is also visible the serious desire that this condition of things should be made as easy as possible for the dethroned and partially dispossessed race; that they should be taught to consider and feel themselves one with the new comers, possessed of an equal interest in the land and committed to the same fortunes; that they should be persuaded of the sincerity of the King's care for their welfare and purpose to protect and benefit them. Theodoric wished that they should be convinced that the famous Roman virtue of justice, with the methods for carrying

[1] 'Romani regni unum velle, una semper opinio sit.'—i. 1.

Digitized by Google

it out, of which Romans were so proud, was of equal value in the eyes of Goths; and that Goths, while fairly proud on their side of their prowess and achievements, were not ashamed to own themselves inferior in historical renown and in the arts of peace to those whom they wished to call their Roman fellow citizens, and could even honestly afford, in comparison with elder brethren who had had such a splendid history, to confess themselves 'barbarians.' These objects of Theodoric's policy are of course expressed the more emphatically by passing through the mind and by being illustrated by the rhetoric of an Italian penman. But Cassiodorus never could have given the orders which he did, or drawn up the *Formulæ*[1] in which he describes the business and duties of the various officers of the State, from the Consul, Patrician, and Prætorian Præfect, the Vicar of Rome, the Duke of the Rhætias, and the Counts of the Goths, down to the chiefs of police at Rome and Ravenna, the heads of the medical staff, the superintendents of the lime-kilns and the armouries, the masters of the mint and the notaries, tax-collectors, and police, unless he was pretty clear about what his master meant him to say. He was too intimate and familiar with Theodoric to mistake him, and Theodoric was too formidable a person to deceive or misinterpret.

The leading and prominent subject of the papers is undoubtedly the enforcement and maintenance of right and justice. There were two classes of questions which under the circumstances of the time were continually requiring the interference of a just ruler. There were questions about the collection of the revenue, and questions arising from the changes in property consequent on the barbarian settlements in Italy. In both these matters the orders which Cassiodorus was commissioned to put into shape and to transmit show watchfulness, humanity, and the desire to uphold equity and right against the encroachments of power or the privilege of race. Thus it is one of the commonplaces of history that one of the causes of the downfall of the Empire was the inequality and oppression of the fiscal administration. It was not only, or so much, that the assessment of revenue demanded for the State was excessive, though this at times was the case; it was that the collection was partial and unjust. The revenue consisted mainly of two great portions, customary poll taxes and ground rents, or land tax, and a varying taxation professedly revised and assessed anew every fifteen years; and each province and *curia*, or municipality, had its portion assigned

[1] *Variæ*, books vi. and vii.

Digitized by Google

of the general sum, which it was bound to make up in a lump to the treasury. But in the repartition of these imposts on the estates of a province or the individuals of the *curia* there was room for all kinds of unfairness. Powerful men set at nought their obligations; crafty men, on one pretence or another, sometimes by entering into the service of the Church, wriggled out of them. Corrupt or lazy collectors lined their pockets or saved themselves trouble by making those who were in their power pay for those who evaded or defied them. All the tricks and villanies of uncontrolled tax-farming and tax-gathering were practised, and drove the wretched tax-payers to despair. Men ran away from their property, or were sold up for hopeless debts. The collection of Cassiodorus shows how sensible Theodoric was to evils which were destroying the resources of the kingdom and the peace and happiness of its inhabitants. The senators at Rome, the great landed proprietors throughout Italy, were the great offenders.[1] Theodoric appeals to their honour and their pride. They had inherited their great place, he tells them, that they might set a public example of justice and sense of duty; but it had appeared from the official reports of his judges and inspectors for the provinces that the great senatorial houses had paid little or nothing of their quota to the revenue. The consequence was that the collectors had turned upon the poorer proprietors on the spot, and had increased their burdens to make up the full sum of the assessment, to the great damage of the provinces. The King proceeds to require the Conscript Fathers, who are equally bound with him to exert themselves for the common weal, to pay their assessment for the year in the usual three instalments; and he informs them that he intends to make this order public in the provinces, that any person who has been aggrieved may know that justice is to be had. And accordingly he sends a circular to the provinces, setting forth these abuses in the collection of the revenue, declaring his intention to stop them, and inviting all proprietors or members of municipalities (*possessores sive curiales*), who have been unjustly surcharged on account of the default of others, to make their complaints. He is as peremptory with the Gothic defaulters of Adria,[2] who probably did not see why such valiant soldiers as themselves should be taxed like provincials, and who, if they had been allowed, would have left their quota of the taxes to be added to that of their Italian neighbours and to be paid by them.

[1] ii. 24.

[2] i. 19; cf. Hegel, *Geschichte der Städteverfassung von Italien*, i. p. 107.

Digitized by Google

His language is a remarkable testimony to the silent resignation with which the provincials endured the oppression of the fiscal officials, and which Theodoric invites them to break,[1]

'The voice of suffering is ordinarily loud. People, when they are aggrieved, do not usually restrain themselves, and the mind of the injured feeds itself with outcries. Still language will flow forth more freely if it is set at liberty by our authority. Now we hate that the wretched should be oppressed. We are distressed at the wrongs of men who make no complaint. The sufferings which the victims hide reach us all the more swiftly.'

This regard for equity appears in another form in the care taken that a grant to one person of exemption from a fiscal burden should not increase those of his neighbours. In a letter to the proprietors and municipal authorities of Trent Theodoric informs them that he has granted a property free of taxes to Butilianus the priest.[2] But he says that he does not choose that his liberality should be hurtful to others; and so he deducts from the sum total of their assessment the portion of it chargeable on the land of Butilianus, and remitted to him, which otherwise would have been thrown on the other tax-payers. 'We will not have that contributed by others which we have excused in an individual case; lest—what God forbid—a deserving man's reward should be an innocent man's loss.' After a time of distress he suspends the excise on wine, corn, and oil, levied, according to ancient custom, at markets and harbours;[3] the provinces needed rest after hard times, and ships must not be frightened away from the ports by the collectors, who often inflicted more damage on them than the sea itself. The march of armies,[4] even friendly ones, was usually a terrible scourge to the provinces. Theodoric takes off the yearly contribution from the provincials of the Cottian Alps, the dwellers in the Valley of Susa, because the passage of the Gothic troops had unavoidably damaged those for whom they fought.

But this anxiety to be just, and to improve the methods of collecting the revenue, is combined with keen vigilance for the revenue itself. 'That it is our wish to oppress no one,' he says, 'is no reason why we should lose what is our due.'[5] Officials are warned not to let the taxes which are due on three terms in the year fall into arrear; it is in the interest of the tax-payer that his debt should not grow

[1] ii. 25.

[2] ii. 17; cf. Savigny, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, i. 334, who wrongly infers from this the Goths were as such exempt from municipal taxes. [3] iv. 19. [4] iv. 36. [5] i. 19.

Digitized by Google

through the collector's easy carelessness. 'In a certain way kindness becomes the mother of harshness, when you first neglect to give a man notice of what is due from him and afterwards are compelled to exact it from him.'[1] Not unnaturally, the conquering race did not always see why they should have to pay rent and taxes like the Romans; the Gothic settlers in Tuscany and Picenum were refractory and fell into arrears, and a strict commission was issued to bring them to reason.[2] It was necessary, the King says, to stop 'this kind of extravagance in the beginning, or it would spread;' and accordingly the houses of those who would not pay were to be seized for the treasury, and the ungrateful military settlers, who, besides their 'donative' as soldiers, had received their lands from the King's bounty, as they would not pay the little that was due from them, were to lose much.

One of the great difficulties of the state of things with which Theodoric had to deal, in carrying out his policy of conciliation and fusion, must, of course, have been the relations between the two races. He claimed that they had become one; he wished that they should appear so to themselves and to the world; he saw that the strength of his kingdom depended on the two nations working willingly together. But, whatever he might wish, they could not forget what each was to the other, any more than at the best of times English and Irish, Austrians and Lombards, have been able to forget it. Yet, as far as it appears, he did his best to avoid the faults so easily and so commonly committed under like circumstances. He kept a strong check on the claims of the conquering race. He showed the most frank and willing readiness to do full justice to those of the conquered race. The following are the terms of a commission of a provincial 'Count of the Goths' addressed to the people over whom he was placed:—[3]

'Seeing that, by God's help, we know that there are Goths dwelling and mingled among you, we have thought it necessary, lest among neighbours there should arise, as is wont, any want of order, to send to you [*So-and-so*], a right honourable person, well approved to us by his good behaviour, as Count. It will be his business, according to our edicts, if any matter arise between Goth and Goth, to decide it; if a controversy should arise between a Goth and a Roman, he shall call in a prudent Roman as assessor, and shall settle the dispute according to right. But between two Romans, Romans are to hear the case—that is, the judges whom we appoint throughout the provinces.[4] Thus everyone's rights will be maintained, and under a diversity of judges one and the same rule of justice will embrace

[1] iii. 8. [2] iv. 14. [3] vii. 3. [4] Cf. iii. 13.

Digitized by Google

all. Thus joined in a bond of common peace, both nations, by God's favour, may enjoy a happy tranquillity. But know ye, that we have equally a love towards all; he, however, will best recommend himself to our regard who restrains his will and is well affected to the laws. We love not aught unbecoming the life of a citizen (*aliquid incivile*); we detest the wickedness of insolence with all who are guilty of it. Violence is hateful to our love of mercy. In matters of judgment let the laws prevail, not the strong arm. You, who all form one kingdom, shape your objects of life in common. Let each people hear what we value. Let the Romans be your neighbours in love as they are in possessions; and you, Romans, ought heartily to love the Goths, who increase the numbers of your population in peace, and who in war are the defenders of the whole commonwealth.'

Goths and Romans could not but be distinct in feelings and ways of life, and it is assumed everywhere that the calling of the Goths was war, and that of the Romans peace.[1] But, as far as Theodoric could do it, their equal rights were maintained.[2] The Roman machinery of civil life was sedulously and universally kept up; any invasion of Roman civil rights called forth rebuke and repression. A question of disputed possession between a Roman and a 'barbarian'[3] is settled on this principle: if the 'barbarian' took possession since the day when Theodoric won his victory on the Isonzo (489), the victory which gave him Italy, the claimant must produce his written title; if it was before that date, Theodoric refuses to be responsible for anything that took place before he was king, or to open any controversy about it.

Theodoric's anxiety to introduce habits of law and order among his barbarian subjects is illustrated by two letters[4] relating to the population which had taken the place of the Goths in their old seats by the Danube and the Drave, that part of the old Pannonia of which Sirmium, not far from the modern Belgrade, was the capital. They were probably a mixture of races—Herules, Gepids, and Suabes—who had followed in the track of the Goths as the Goths moved westward; but they formed part of what Theodoric claimed as his kingdom. He sends a governor to keep them in order, and to accustom them to the rule of impartial law and justice. He is a person with the singular name of Colossæus. The proper names which occur in Cassiodorus are often curious,

[1] See viii. 3; xii. 5: 'dum belligerat Gothorum exercitus, sit in pace Romanus;' iii. 38: 'Vivat noster exercitus civiliter cum Romanis.'

[2] Cf. i. 27: 'Si *exterarum gentium* [*i.e.* the 'barbarians'] *mores sub lege moderamur; si juri Romano servit quiaquid sociatur Italiæ. . . .*' And iii. 36: 'Cum moris nostri sit *ad leges cuncta referre.*'

[3] i. 18. [4] iii. 23, 24.

Digitized by Google

and suggest questions as to the intermixture and dispersion of races which are now perhaps beyond our reach to answer. To this Colossæus Theodoric gives his commission, and further commends him to the people whom he is to govern—'Universis Barbaris et Romanis per Pannoniam constitutis, Theodoricus Rex.' There are two points which are worth noticing in these letters. One is that the particular 'barbarous' custom which Theodoric wants to put down is that of the duel, or judicial combat.

'This further we wish to say to you,' is the king's address to the population, 'that you should seek to direct your courage, not against yourselves, but against the enemy. Let not trifles urge you to extremities. Be content with justice, in which the world rejoices. Why should you have recourse to a duel when you have a judge who cannot be bribed? Lay aside your swords, as you have no foe. It is an evil thing to lift your arm against your kinsmen, for whom you ought with glory to die. What is the use of the tongue to man if it is his armed hand which pleads his cause? or how can it be believed that there is peace if under civilized order (*sub civilitate*) men still fight?'

'Make them contend,' says the commission to Colossæus, 'with words rather than weapons. Let them not count it a reproach to lose their cause.'

The other point is the amusing self-complacency with which the example of the Goths, and their progress in the ways of order and civilization, are held up for the imitation of their less advanced barbarian kinsfolk. 'Favour justice,' the king writes to Colossæus; 'protect with courage innocence of heart; so that, in contrast to the evil customs of the nations, you may hold up the justice of the Goths, who have ever so kept the mean of excellence, that they had both the wisdom of the Romans and the prowess of the nations.' 'Imitate our Goths,' he writes to his Pannonian subjects, 'who know how to fight when abroad and to be self-controlled at home. We desire you so to live as by God's help you see that our kinsfolk have flourished.'

It is this strong desire for justice, for conciliation, for a good understanding between his various subjects, for their protection, for their welfare, for the improvement and advancement of their conditions of life, and the visible care and forethought for these objects appearing throughout this miscellaneous collection of public papers, which impart strength and substance to the idea of Theodoric's rule which they present. But for this it might easily seem that the interest shown by him in the results and adjuncts of Roman civiliza-

Digitized by Google

tion was merely a thin veneer over the still untamed coarseness of barbarian habits and character. That the natural fierceness of the barbarian chief was not yet tamed in the King of Italy appeared but too clearly in the outbreak of savage cruelty towards the end of his reign, in which Boethius perished. But it is impossible to read these curious documents without seeing through the rhetoric of the Latin secretary how thoroughly in earnest his great German master was in his wish to govern justly, wisely, temperately. We know too little to be able to say how his instructions were carried out. Self-will was powerful; distances were great between the King and the Præfect, and between the Præfect and the provincial Count. Every order, too, which we read in Cassiodorus may not have been of Theodoric's dictation; something, perhaps much, may have been left to the secretary's own responsibility and judgment. But the general outline of the purpose of government is too strongly drawn to be mistaken. A Roman with Christian ideas of right, with the ideas of these State papers about the reconciliation of conqueror and conquered, could not have continued so long to be the confidential and actively employed minister of the Gothic king, if the Gothic king, with all his shortcomings, had not had the instincts, the wisdom, the high ambition, which were afterwards to be seen on a grander scale in the great Frank emperor.

But a collection of Parliamentary blue-books could not contain a more miscellaneous assortment of subjects than the *Variæ* of Cassiodorus. The first letter in the collection is a grand assertion of the unity of the Roman Empire, and of Romans and barbarians in government and interest. The second is a wonderful objurgation of a negligent provincial officer, whose business it was to provide purple dye for the silk and woollen of the king's robes. The dye was produced at Hydruntum or Otranto, from a shell-fish, the *murex*, the collection of which, and the preparation from it of the dye, employed a great number of persons, and appears to have been superintended by a State official. Cassiodorus is not content with scolding this officer as if he had been guilty of something as bad as treason, but he takes the opportunity of showing how he can describe in grand language the very disgusting process by which the coveted purple was produced from heaps of the rotting and stinking shell-fish. But the tone in which the superintendent of the manufacture is taken to task for his delays is curious.

Digitized by Google

'We have learned from the report of Count Stephen [it is Theodoric who is supposed to speak] that the work of the Sacred robes, which we wish to be completed with the necessary speed, is suspended, and the making of them interrupted; and it is clear that you are the person who, by withholding a usual supply, have produced this abominable delay; for we are convinced that some negligence must have occurred to cause that the milky tresses of silk, twice or thrice dipped, have yet blushed less than they ought with that most beautiful intoxication, or that the wool has not drunk the choicest quality of the adorable purple. So that if the inspector of the sea at Otranto had collected the shell-fish which give the dye, in the usual way, and at the right time, that Neptunian heap, the parent of the ever-blooming purple, the adorner of the throne, dissolved with abundance of rains, would have set free the courtly shower with its flame-coloured liquid. That colour, in the overpowering charm of its freshness, that blushing darkness, that crimson blackness, distinguishes the ruler, points out the lord, and is the warrant to the human race that it cannot be mistaken in its prince's countenance.'

Then, after enlarging on the very disagreeable process of preparing the dye from the fish—they were left for six months to rot, 'till even to the most sagacious of nostrils they ceased to be noisome'—he proceeds with his invective against the unlucky defaulter.

'If no part of the usual process of preparation was left out, we wonder that you did not recollect your own dangers, considering that it is the guilt of sacrilege to offend in respect of such robes. What are they about, all these workmen, all these crews of sailors, all these families of labourers? You, too, with the dignity of a Count, give orders to such numbers, you fence yourself round with the prestige of so great a name, that you are thought almost to act the king, you seem in many things to be despotic over your fellow-citizens. Your negligence is a blow to this position, which had both given you a high place in the province and was the occasion of your appearing with honour in the presence of your prince. So that, if regard for your own interest does not forsake you, if you have any feeling for your own safety, within such and such a day after the bearer of this reaches you hasten to come with the dye, which you have been accustomed to provide every year for our wardrobe; for we shall send you not a commissioner, but an avenger, if you imagine that you may trifle with any further delays.'

The fidgety letter about purple dyes is a curious survival of the Oriental ideas of pomp which had gradually, under the Cæsars, worked their way into the Latin world; the occasion, the temper, the etiquette of phrases, as about the '*Sacred* robes,' the rhetoric and taste are what might be looked for in a Persian or Syrian court rather than in that of Theodoric.

Digitized by Google

But it was part of Theodoric's policy to enter into the fashions and humours of his Latin subjects, as well as to care for their substantial prosperity. As at Rome it was the mode to take a side with one or other of the colours in the circus, the Green or the Blue, Theodoric, probably at the suggestion of Cassiodorus,[1] confers his patronage on the Greens; and as party feeling ran high, and resulted in rioting and some high-handed proceedings on the part of powerful Blues, the great Gothic king and his minister have to send letter after letter to the authorities at Rome instructing them to take care that the Green party, and especially the favourers of Helladius,[2] the pantomime dancer, have their fair chance, and that if the jealousy of the opposite party leads to foul play, the culprits, however high their rank, are to be made an example of. But these letters are adverted to only to illustrate the multifarious character of the collection, and to show how the administration under the great barbarian king descended into minute details which might have been thought entirely alien from his habits and interests. The bulk of the papers refer to much more serious matters, though everywhere the letters abound with curious and often instructive particulars. The care of the king appears in them for the repair, the adornment, the defence, of his cities, for the reclaiming of waste lands and the draining of those marshes which were then, as they are now, the plague of Italy, for keeping the aqueducts and sewers in good order, for the provisioning of the provinces, for the encouragement of such trade and commerce as existed—and in spite of wars and invasions there was a good deal—for the protection of harbours, the regulation of the postal service established under the Empire, as well as for the due administration of justice, and the alleviation of the burdens which war and marching armies brought upon the sorely stricken provinces. And alternating with these subjects we have instructions to individual officers on service, decisions, which usually seem equitable ones, on individual cases of hardship or distress brought to the king's knowledge, and all that interference of the supreme power in the cause of the poor and helpless which, though it belongs to a rude and imperfect stage of government, is yet, till government has attained its higher stages of improved responsibility, the only real remedy against the inevitable abuses of power in the hands of subordinate agents. As all these letters were called for by special cases —by reports, complaints, appeals, petitions for grants—they

[1] i. 20, 21, 27, 31–3. [2] i. 32.

Digitized by Google

throw such a light on the actual working of the machine of government as no general account of the time, even if such existed, could supply. They show very close attention to the current business and wants of the kingdom; they show the kind of difficulties and questions which arose where the old and the new were daily meeting, and the ambitious and sanguine German was trying to infuse new life into the exhausted and damaged frame of Italian civilization, both in its rural and its civic forms. And though they only show us part of what was going on under the Gothic rule, and show it us through the eyes of an Italian who was the devoted servant of the barbarian king, they leave the impression of remarkable industry, good sense, and honesty in administering the State, and of a sincere attempt to repair the ruins which war and misgovernment had made in Italy. 'Nos, quibus cordi est in melius cuncta mutare,'[1] was no idle boast, whether applied to what Cassiodorus calls the 'tellus naufraga' of the stagnant and useless marshes of Spoleto, or to the still more truly 'shipwrecked land' which once had been the seat of the empire of the world.

Two features have to be noticed in these curious letters. One is the character of the style. They belong, as every one knows, to a declining time of Latin literature; but yet it was a time when the great models of Latin writing were still admired. It was not so long ago since S. Augustine was writing with wonderful force and command of the language, and contemporaries of Cassiodorus, like Boethius, though a long way from the classical writers in style and vocabulary, were still writing clearly and unaffectedly. But the first thing that strikes the reader of Cassiodorus is his grandiloquence. He is a master of what, we believe, is now called 'high faluting.' The simplest orders must be given in strained and pompous language; and as the words which he chooses are frequently used with a turn and colour not familiar in classical Latin, his instructions are sometimes obscure and hard to construe. But it is not the language only. His idea of an official document, an appointment, an ordinary command, a set of instructions, is the oddest conceivable. He always, or almost always, begins with a general maxim, from the truth and importance of which he deduces the particular order which he has to convey; and he usually clenches the order with another generality. Thus:—[2]

'To Ampelius, Despotius, and Theodulus, senators, King Theodoric.

[1] ii. 21; cf. iii. 31.

[2] ii. 23.

Digitized by Google

'It becomes the discipline of our time that they who give themselves to what is useful to the public should not be hindered with unnecessary burdens. Nor is it fitting that any one's ill-will should prejudice our customary arrangements. Wherefore apply your industry strenuously to the potteries granted you by royal authority; and fear not that you can be transferred to other employments, considering that we hardly believe that you can accomplish what is at present enjoined on you. There shall be an end, then, once for all, to the wicked interference of bad men, and our authority shall bring to nought the success of obscure intrigues. For *he* hates in vain, against whom the clemency of the prince presents its shield.'

This is a type of numberless letters. Never was an official in his public correspondence so 'full of wise saws and modern instances,' brought from every department of nature, history, and literature. The king gives leave to the sons of Ecdicius,[1] who want to attend their father's funeral, to be absent from Rome: for Theodoric was very strict in not allowing Romans of rank to leave Rome without reason or for an indefinite time, it being a great point with him to keep up the population and the attractions of the capital.[2] But his secretary is not content with simply giving the permission; he gives in antithetic sentences the reasons for paying the last honours to the dead.

'Mourning is inconsolable when we may not be present at the burial of our dead; for a man never can forgive himself who has not paid due honour to their ashes. With what a ransom did not Priam redeem Hector? He besought Achilles in the height of his wrath: he knelt before him armed as he was; he preferred to risk his own life to defrauding the corpse of its due.'

Again, he orders the execution of some slaves who had killed their master and left him unburied. He enlarges on the atrocity of their crime, and he proceeds to compare human beings with vultures, very much to the disadvantage of the former.

'Alas! alas! kindness is found in birds of the air which is forgotten by mankind. The vulture itself, which lives on the corpses of the dead, this huge creature is known not to molest the smaller birds, but when the hawk attacks the life of the feathered race the vulture smites it with its wings, tears it with its beak, and with all its force tries to help those in danger. And these men cannot spare one whom they know to be their fellow-man! The vulture will not kill in order that it may feed; these servants chose to kill him who in his lifetime had been wont to feed them. Let *him*, then, become the repast of the pious vulture who had the heart so cruelly to wish

[1] ii. 22. [2] *e.g.* iv. 48.

Digitized by Google

for the death of the shepherd. It is well that he should be allotted such a sepulchre, who caused his master to be without burial.'[1]

But he has a still more curious habit. He is always ready to turn a purely business letter on the most matter-of-fact subject into a regular dissertation on physics, mechanics, philosophy, or history. Thus he has to write in the king's name to Boethius, informing him that the chiefs of the body-guard have sent in a joint complaint to the king that their pay was given them in coin which was under weight, and commanding Boethius to see that so serious and so dangerous a malpractice was set right.[2] But then the secretary makes the king go off into a long series of reflections on the properties and value of the art of arithmetic—'*hæc quæ appellatur arithmetica, inter ambigua mundi certissima ratione consistit*'—and from this, into considerations on the importance of true weights and measures. These sentences and maxims are often vigorous and striking enough, but they have obviously nothing to do with the real business of the letter; they are grotesque when imagined in the mouth of the Gothic king, and it is too plain that they are simply put in to show off the secretary's varied knowledge and power of fine writing. Another letter of the same kind, also to Boethius, tells him that Gundibald, King of the Burgundians, had asked Theodoric to send him a water-clock; and Boethius is requested to apply his renowned mechanical skill to its construction.[3] All this is spun out into a long epistle. The policy of Theodoric suggests that the neighbouring kings should be kept in good humour by compliance with their requests for presents—toys and mechanical inventions—which in Italy every one is familiar with, but which abroad among Burgundians and such like are miraculous.[4] Then Boethius's learning and

[1] ii. 19. [2] i. 10. [3] i. 45, 46.

[4] 'Spernenda non sunt quæ a vicinis regibus præsumptionis gratia postulantur; dum plerumque res parvæ plus prævalent præstare quam magnæ possunt obtinere divitiæ. Frequenter enim quod arma explere nequeunt, oblectamenta suavitatis imponunt. Sit ergo pro republica et cum ludere videamur. Nam ideo voluptuosa quærimus, ut per ipsa seria compleamus. Burgundionum itaque Dominus a nobis magnopere postulavit ut horologium . . . ei transmittere deberemus . . . Quod nobis est quotidianum, illis videtur esse miraculum.' The two letters are curious. Their tone *about* the Burgundians is that of a civilized European talking of a king and people of Siam or Ashantee: 'Agnoscant per te exteræ gentes, tales nos habere nobiles, quales leguntur auctores. Quoties non sunt crediturí quod viderint; quoties hanc veritatem lusoria somnia putabunt? et quando fuerint a stupore conversi, non audebunt se æquales nobis dicere, apud quos sciunt sapientes talia cogitasse.' The tone *to* the Burgundian king is that of a patronizing invitation to appreciate the

Digitized by Google

scientific attainments are set forth, and the marvels which physical science has achieved are enumerated with as much enthusiasm as they might be by a modern lecturer, in a catalogue which, though indistinct from the poetical terms employed, contains some curious details of the application of chemical and mechanical arts. And then after some rather fine bursts about the victories of science over nature—'o artis inæstimabilis virtus, quæ dum se dicit luderè, naturæ prævalet secreta vulgare;' or again, 'mechanicus, si fas est dicere, pene *socius est naturæ*, occulta reserans, manifesta convertens, miraculis ludens'—sentences which have a Baconian ring about them—Boethius is instructed to make the clock.

The other feature to be noticed is equally characteristic of the time and of the man. Several of these letters are about Cassiodorus himself, or addressed to him by the King.[1] If these letters were merely instructions officially directed to him about the business of his department, such as two letters from one of Theodoric's successors, Theodahad,[2] about the regulations of the market and trades, there would be nothing extraordinary in the minister himself drawing up the orders on which he was to act. But the letters referred to are much more than this. They are letters written in the king's name by Cassiodorus himself, about himself, and to himself—letters of highest commendation, full of unstinted praise of his qualities and services, and supplying us with a full and eulogistic account of his career and employments. The fashion of a man puffing himself is an old one, and is not likely in any age to become obsolete. We have heard of distinguished authors reviewing their own books, and of a popular divine announcing himself, in a communication traced to his own pen, as 'the great and good;' but this was veiled

inventions of Gothic and Roman civilization: 'Habetote in vestra patria, quod aliquando vidistis [*e.g.* in 473, when Gundibald named Glycerius emperor] in civitate Romana. . . . Discat sub vobis Burgundia res subtilissimas inspicere, et antiquorum inventa laudare, per quos propositum gentile deponit.' And then the advantages to Burgundy of having a *Horologium* are set forth: 'Distinguat spatia diei, actibus suis horarum aptissime momenta constituat. Ordo vitæ confusus agitur, si talis discretio sub veritate nescitur. Belluarum quippe ritus est ex ventris esurie horas sentire.'

[1] ix. 24, 25; i. 3, 4; iii. 28. It is possible that the letters in books i. and iii., addressed to Cassiodorus '*the Patrician*,' may have been, as Clinton thinks, addressed to his father. He never enumerates the Patriciat among his own dignities. But those in book ix. are certainly addressed to himself.

[2] ix. 27, 28.

Digitized by Google

under a modest reserve. There is no concealment about Cassiodorus. With the utmost simplicity and frankness he introduces these specimens of laboured eloquence and historical panegyric on himself, composed by himself, into the collection which he himself publishes. It is, no doubt, a trait of the man's natural vanity, which comes out with equal distinctness in the display which he everywhere makes of his literary accomplishments. But the unsuspicious openness of the self-glorification of Cassiodorus seems to belong to the time. He obviously thought there was nothing to be shy about or to be ashamed of. The habit of panegyrics, cultivated in the Roman schools and practised in the Roman assemblies, the taste for it, and the prevalent idea that this was the great use of artificial eloquence, had deadened men's sense of the becoming. Men who were vying with one another in strained and extravagant praises of others naturally came to think that this was the natural mode of expressing their fair sense of their own claims and merits. It was the way, at which his age at least would not be shocked, of putting on record services which really were valuable and unwearied, the opinion which Theodoric had of him, and the free and confidential relations between the Gothic king and his Italian minister. But one would like to know what were Theodoric's thoughts, and perhaps comments, when Cassiodorus read over to him the letters about Cassiodorus which were to go out in the great 'Barbarian's' name. Probably most of their eloquence was lost upon him.

Gibbon, of course, sneers at Cassiodorus. He might, perhaps, have had an instinct that the palpable faults of Cassiodorus were, in exaggeration and caricature, just the faults with which his own manner of writing was reproached. But with all these faults the collection is invaluable. It is one of the most varied and lifelike pictures of the daily march of a real administration in a very dim and distant time which we possess. What would we give if Augustus or Trajan had had a Cassiodorus, a secretary who preserved his despatches and records on passing emergencies as well as on large questions of policy. The interest of some of Pliny's letters shows what the value of such records would be. And the collection of Cassiodorus refers to a very critical and important period in the history of Italy and Christendom. It was the meeting point of two great tendencies, and Theodoric's great attempt was to reconcile and harmonize them. He was not going to give up his German sympathies, his German habits of thought, the conviction that the Germans were the

Digitized by Google

stronger, nobler, greater race, the national consciousness that led him to take the position of the elder brother among his wilder and less instructed and ruder brethren, the kings of the Franks, and Visigoths, and Burgundians, and Vandals, and Herules. But he saw and valued what they knew nothing about except to despise it: all that Rome had done and had won for the good order, the peace, the growing welfare, of human life. Without giving up or imperilling the interests of his own great race, he wanted to preserve this. He did more; he wanted to make it, as far as it was useful, the possession and heritage of his people. He wanted to educate his Goths, not in Latin customs and elegancies and softnesses, but in the Latin value for law and justice, for settled life, for husbandry, for building; and ultimately he hoped, by protecting the weaker but subtler Latins without allowing them any dangerous superiority, to fuse the two races into a new nation with the old name of Roman. This was his aim and line of work, not the same, but in part coincident with that of those Italians who are represented by Cassiodorus, and of whom there were certainly not a few[1]—men who thought it best for Italy frankly and in good faith to co-operate with Theodoric in his evident efforts after conciliation, justice, and general improvement. But to them their great interest was in what had come down from the great times of the Empire. Their aim and hope was still to keep Italy Italian, and to make the Goths, as Theodoric professed, Romans. They naturally put their experience to account in carrying out Theodoric's policy, and sought to help him, in their own interest as much as in his. And in such a monument as the *Variæ* of Cassiodorus we see the desperate efforts of Italian nationality to save what could be saved in the wreck and confusion of the 'naufraga tellus.' We see in the literary colour, as well as in the political earnestness of Theodoric's minister, the agonized and convulsive grasp at the fragments of departing culture and organization amid the destructive and unknown forces of the revolution which was running its course. Theodoric hoped to have directed and shaped it, to have controlled its fierceness, to have averted its dangers. He had the idea of a new, a revived, a united Italy. And it might have been, if what he began had been carried on. But

[1] See the striking account of Liberius, first under Odoacer, then under Theodoric, ii. 16: 'Flexo jam pene domino [Odoacer], nullis est terroribus inclinatus; sustinuit immobilis ruinam principis sui; nec novitas illum turbare potuit, quam etiam ferocitas gentilis expavit. Probavimus hominis fidem: tristis ad jura nostra transivit.'

Digitized by Google

it was not to be. He died and left anarchy in the young and unripe kingdom. Then came Belisarius and Narses. After them came the Lombards. After the Lombards came the Franks. And then the destiny of Italy during the Middle Ages was decided. There was to be no such Italy as Theodoric imagined yet.

The letters of Cassiodorus, besides the light which they throw on the public history of his time, are a storehouse of curious and authentic information on the condition of Italy and its social state; the ways of everyday life, the productions, the industries, the tastes and fashions of its people. These glimpses of real life come from Cassiodorus's very unbusiness-like and very absurd way of writing; he never can resist the temptation to tack on a description, more or less elaborate, to a despatch or an order. Thus he has to protect the inhabitants of Como, a town which lay at the junction of many roads, from the excessive burdens required of them in the service of the posts; and to this we owe a very interesting picture of the town and lake as they appeared to him.[1] He orders a sum of money to be paid for the supply of paper to the public offices; and on this he takes the opportunity to write at large about the use and the manufacture of paper at his time.[2] It was part of his business to stock the royal cellar, and to cater for the royal buttery and cheese-room; he has to send orders to the landed gentry of Verona to provide certain wines to be purchased for the royal table,[3] to the Chancellor of Lucania to forward with all speed a supply of Bruttian wine and cheese from the Calabrian Sila, of the quality which, when put before the King from his secretary's own cellars, had greatly pleased the taste of the *Rerum Dominus;* and on this we get an interesting though very irrelevant little lecture on the character of the wines then in fashion, and on the qualities which then made good cheese—its oiliness, its sweetness, its smell of aromatic herbs.[4] He writes to exempt the territory of Rhegium from the obligation of supplying so much wheat and lard; the exception is grounded on the nature of its soil, suited not to corn and pasture, but to vineyards and spade husbandry; and then we have an account of its market gardens and its choice fish. In his character as Prætorian Præfect he writes to order the chancellor of the province to put an end to some oppressive exactions in the shape of purveyance and judicial fees, of which the people of Scyllacium —Squillace—complained;[5] and this gives him the opportunity

[1] xi. 14. [2] xi. 38. [3] xii. 4. [4] xii. 12. [5] xii. 15.

Digitized by Google

of describing the beauty and the fine climate of the district, a region where his own patrimony was situated, and where he afterwards founded the monastic and literary retreat in which he ended his days.[1] Another letter describes the repairs necessary for the Flaminian Way [2] in an order to get the road ready for the passage of the army; another gives directions for the construction of a wooden bridge over the Tiber for the king's entry into Rome;[3] another, in an order to send wine and oil by sea from Istria, puts before us the barge navigation of the north of Italy,[4] by craft that were at once, like some of our London barges, canal boats and sea-going vessels. The correspondents of Cassiodorus must, we should suppose, have thought him the most tiresome of bores; but for us he preserves sketches of the goings on of his time, full of colour and life, which we might look for in vain elsewhere.

Cassiodorus continued in office after the death of his great master (526), and served his successors, Amalasuntha and her son, the boy king Athalaric, her base murderer, Theodahad, and her avenger, Vitiges. Letters written in the name of Vitiges (536–540), and written apparently early in his short reign, are the last State papers which he has inserted in his collection. He probably retired about this time to his monastery near Squillace, to spend his last days in devotion and literary pursuits, in the study of Scripture, in the composition of elementary treatises, meant to be useful to the ill-educated people round him, in the multiplication of copies of books and the formation of an instructive library. He saw the overthrow of the Goths; he probably heard of the advent of the Lombards. With all his faults, he was a man who redeemed his age from the imputation of want of public spirit, of stupid and inert selfishness, of coarse ignorance. So important a collection as that of his 'various' letters deserves a better and more helpful edition than we yet possess of it. If our Universities are too busy for such tasks, we must hope that the distinguished German scholars who are at work on the *Monumenta Historica Germaniæ*, who have given us such

[1] The double monastery, Vivariense and Castelliense, one for cœnobites, the other for hermits, of which he has left a description (*Div. Litt.* c. 29), and where he intended that learning, both classical and theological, should find a refuge. He had attempted to found schools like those of Alexandria at Rome in conjunction with Pope Agapetus (535–6), but the wars wrecked his plans (*Div. Litt.* Præf.). Why do the articles in Dr. Smith's *Dictionaries of Biography* speak of the 'Monasterium Vivariense' as '*Viviers*,' as if it was in France, and not in Italy? The name answers to that of an English training college, 'Fish-ponds,' near Bristol.

[2] xii. 18. [3] xii. 19. [4] xii. 24.

Digitized by Google

admirable specimens of their work in Waitz's *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum*, in the editions of *Salvian*, *Victor Vitensis*, *Eugippius*, and others, and who are preparing an edition of Jordanes, and are said to be contemplating one of the letters of Gregory the Great, will in due time take in hand the important and not very easy work of editing, as they ought to be edited, both as to text and elucidations, the letters of the Italian secretary of the greatest of their early kings.

ART. II.—ANGLO-ISRAELISM.

1. *Forty-seven Identifications of the British Nation with the Lost House of Israel.* Founded upon Five Hundred Scripture Proofs. By EDWARD HINE. One Hundred and Twentieth Thousand. (London.)
2. *The Great Pyramid of Egypt.* A Digest of Great Pyramid Teaching Adapted to the Comprehension of the Unlearned and of the Unscientific. By PHILO-ISRAEL. (London.)
3. *Life from the Dead.* A National Journal Advocating the Identity of the British Nation with the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel. Edited by EDWARD HINE. Fourpence, Monthly. (London.)
4. *The Banner of Israel.* Edited by PHILO-ISRAEL. One Penny, Weekly. (London.)
5. *Are Englishmen Israelites?* A Three Nights' Debate in Exeter Hall, London. (London.)
6. *Anglo-Israelism Refuted.* A Lecture. By ROBERT ROBERTS. (London.)
7. *Are we Israelites?* The Testimony of History, Philology, and Ethnology on the Subject. By the Rev. BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE, M.A., Rector of Shillingford, Exeter. With an Introduction by PHILO-ISRAEL. (London.)
8. *Gospel Truth and Anglo-Israel Heresy.* By J. C. MCCLELLAN, Author of *Anglo-Israelism, its Pernicious Nature Freely Exposed.* (London.)
9. *The Anglo-Israel Post Bag: or, How Arthur came to see It.* By the Right Rev. Bishop TITCOMB. (London.)

THE movement popularly known as Anglo-Israelism is one of the most remarkable of the minor currents of contemporary thought. While it remains absolutely unintelligible to

Digitized by Google

outsiders, who regard with a wonder mixed with disdain its arguments and its conclusions alike, yet it seems to exercise over a continually widening circle of adherents a considerable attraction. Like Good Templarism, Plymouth Brethrenism, or Freemasonry, it is a quasi-religion, and, once accepted, is looked upon as the most important of all religious truths. 'I clearly saw,' says the Coryphæus of the movement, 'that the identity of the lost ten tribes of Israel was the one grand, great essential of the age, the one thing to be accomplished before the sublime conceptions of the mind of the Almighty, given forth in His eternal Word, could be realized.' If the statements made by its adherents are to be taken as well-founded, its publications circulate in enormous numbers. The *Forty-seven Identifications* is marked 'one hundred and twentieth thousand:' the *Flashes of Light* 'forty-sixth thousand.' A monthly magazine, now in its fifth volume, and a weekly newspaper at a penny, show considerable popular interest in the subject, which is skilfully stimulated and kept up by popular lectures, discussions, and such like. The Anthropological Society has, we believe, thought it of sufficient importance to be discussed at their meetings. The 'Identity' has found at least one bishop as an adherent, as we learn from the *Anglo-Israel Post Bag*, mentioned above. Philo-Israel, who is the editor of the weekly newspaper, the *Banner of Israel*, is understood to be a retired Indian civilian—a judge, we believe—who has devoted himself to the propagation of the theory, and has his head-quarters at Bristol; while the rest of the executive is made up by officers of both services, and of a few, only a few, stray clergy in London and elsewhere. Of the Nonconformist ministry it does not seem to have taken hold at all.

We propose, therefore, first to give an account of the theory, and then briefly to discuss the several positions, prophetical and (quasi) historical, on which it claims to rest.

The fundamental thesis which its advocates seek to establish is that the English people are identical with the ten tribes of Israel, which have been for many ages supposed to be lost; and that these Ten Tribes are a chosen and sacred people of God, to the exclusion of the other two, who have been condemned, apparently quite independently of any desert of their own, to rejection, and to the loss of all the privileges attaching to the posterity of Abraham. It may be well, then, to set out in our examination from the point at which these ten tribes, excluding Judah and Benjamin, may be thought to have had a separate or corporate existence, viz. from the disruption of the Davidic monarchy

Digitized by Google

at the accession of Rehoboam, grandson of David, at or near the year 975 B.C. We shall find the figment of some exclusive sacredness of character, said to be attributed to Israel above Judah, negatived as well by the causes of the origin of the Israelitic or Northern monarchy, as by the circumstances of its subsequent history. The revolt of Jeroboam was no less religious than political. He deliberately set up and maintained an idolatrous worship, in order to detach the tribes from their resort to Jerusalem for the accustomed festivals three times a year, which he saw must be the cause of a continual gravitation to the rival kingdom. The first consequence of his policy was to drive all the Priests and Levites to Jerusalem. Deprived thus of the conserving influences of religion, his ill-compacted state fell rapidly into decay. His own name became a byword among the people as 'Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin' (1 Kings xiv. 16 *et passim*); his dynasty died out in his son within a little more than a year after his death; and there followed during the 234 years before the fall of the kingdom he had set up a long-continued anarchy. Of the nineteen kings who reigned during that period not one is morally even respectable, and the greater number attained the throne by usurpation and murder. The tribes had lost their political stability by discarding the Davidic line of kings, and proved incapable of attaching themselves permanently to any other. They remind the modern reader of France, in turn Republican, Constitutional and Imperial, during its long agony, from the expulsion of the Bourbons in 1793 up to the present year. As the one submitted to its stern military despot Jehu, so the other was forced to bear the yoke of Napoleon Bonaparte. Each of these tried to found a dynasty, and each, after an apparent and temporary success, failed eventually in the attempt. Other points of likeness will occur to our readers; we need not, however, pursue them farther, having given, as we imagine, abundant proof that the kingdom of Israel, so far from being the object of a peculiar complacency and special favour from God, was due in its origin to the working of turbulent passions in the followers and to irreligious intrigues in the leader, and that it was a spectacle of licentiousness, cruelty, and general degradation as long as it lasted.

The fall of this ill-omened kingdom and the deportation of its people by Sargon, King of Assyria, took place in B.C. 721. From thence onward to the taking of Jerusalem in B.C. 597, *i.e.* for 124 years, until Judah and Benjamin, with Priests and Levites, with hallowed vessels from the Temple

Digitized by Google

and sacred books of the Law, came to join them in their captivity, we lose sight of the Ten Tribes; and indeed for some seventy years longer, until the return from captivity under Zerubbabel and Jeshua, when the thread of narrative is taken up again in the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, the chronicles of Ezra and Nehemiah, and possibly in the last three chapters of the book of Daniel.

Certain fragmentary notices mention them from time to time, a few of which it may be useful to collect for reference. At first, it would seem, the more devout of the exiles observed the law of Moses (Tobit xiv. 9), but the great body of the tribes having been Baal-worshippers in their own land (Tobit i. 5) adopted the religion and the customs of the Assyrians (i. 10). Similarly, while the stricter Jews retained the knowledge of their genealogies, the tribal relations were generally much relaxed, and the knowledge of them became uncertain (v. 9–12). The names of Nehemiah, Daniel, Tobit, Mordecai, Esther, show that there was no badge of social inferiority endured by the Jews as such, and that many individuals among them rose to high places in court favour and to positions of rule. They were ruled by a subordinate magistrate of their own race, 'the Prince of the Captivity,' רישׁא. The national feeling was kept alive by the utterances of the prophet Ezekiel; and it is probable that some of the Psalms belong to this period.[1] Some portions of the Ten Tribes (2 Kings xvii. 6) were placed 'in Halah and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes'—*i.e.* in Halah, now represented by *Gla*, a large mound on the upper course of the Khabour River (Araxes), a tributary of the Euphrates. Another colony, this time of the later exiles, from Jerusalem, and which included the prophet Ezekiel, we find settled at Tel-abib (the Hill of Green Corn), on the river Chebar, further south (Ezek. iii. 15). Other parties went to Babylon itself (2 Kings xxv. 7).

There were frequent and unrestricted communications between the exiles in Babylon and those left behind in Judæa; and we find the prophet Jeremiah (xxix. 4–7) advising the former to settle down in the country as good citizens and quiet subjects, and to await patiently a future, though distant, restoration to their own land.[2]

[1] Ewald reckons as many as twenty-four.

[2] It appears that the devout among the Ten Tribes confidently expected a restoration to their own land of the entire nation 'from *all places* of their captivity,' not merely of Judah and Benjamin (Tobit xiv. 5), and a rebuilding of Jerusalem. Nor is this weakened as evidence by this

Digitized by Google

There is a singular passage in 2 Esdras which it is possible may be founded on a tradition of some migration still further eastward (xiii. 41):—

'But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river. For the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood till they were passed over. For through that country there was a great way to go, namely, of a year and a half; and the same region is called Arsareth.[1] Then dwelt they there until the latter time.'

There is no distinct authority, that we know of, to corroborate this statement; but it is antecedently probable that a people like the Jews would extend themselves throughout the Assyrian empire, during an exile in it of more than two hundred years; and if we are to judge from the statement in Esther viii. 9, 11, there were, even after the return of large numbers to Palestine, in every one of the provinces of the empire, 'from India unto Ethiopia, an hundred and twenty and seven provinces,' Jews in such force as to make head with fair prospect of success against the numerous and powerful enemies who were induced by the prospect of plunder, or from mere hostility, to attack them. Of these, we are told, they slew so large a number as 75,000 even in this merely defensive warfare, in which it can hardly be supposed that the whole power of the race was put forth; since there would be many localities in which the Israelites would not be attacked at all.

There exist some *data*, though they cannot be called adequate or complete, for computing the *number* of persons carried away to Assyria in the successive deportations which took place. From an Assyrian inscription given by Oppert, and after him by Smith, we learn that the number removed after the fall of Samaria was 27,290;[2] and it may probably have been the case that the drain of people went on to a certain extent for the next hundred years, the system of transplanting peoples from their

chapter not existing in the Chaldee; for even in that case it represents the general expectation and belief among the Israelites, or it would not have found expression there.

[1] אַרְצוֹת = lands. The LXX. has apparently mistaken the word for a proper name.

[2] 'Samaria I besieged. I captured . . . 27,290 people dwelling in the midst of it I carried captive. Fifty chariots from among them I selected, and the rest of them I distributed. My general over them I appointed, and the taxes of the former king I fixed on them.'—(*Assyrian Canon*, p. 125.)

Digitized by Google

local associations and patriotic ties having evidently been adopted as a settled policy by the Assyrian rulers. It was one well known to all the great empires of antiquity, as tending, by the severance of all local ties or feelings of corporate unity, to produce large masses of contented and submissive population. So it was continued by the Babylonian empire when that in its turn obtained the hegemony of the East; and accordingly we find, from 2 Kings xxiv. 14, that from Jerusalem and its vicinity were taken to Babylon about 11,000 captives, and that the remainder of the population (of which the number is not stated) were removed at the death of Zedekiah, *circa* B.C. 588. The prophet Jeremiah (lii. 30) sums up these Babylonian deportations as amounting to 4,600 in all. We have thus:—

From Samaria and its neighbourhood . .	27,290
„ Judæa	11,000
„ „ subsequently	4,600
	42,890

But this, of course, is imperfect; and perhaps a complete list might double the numbers. Another fact also must be borne in mind. *No females* are included in any of these lists. According to the Jewish custom, the men only are reckoned; and we must therefore regard the caravans of exiles as having included, from first to last, not far short of 200,000 souls. Great numbers besides these took refuge in Egypt. The great emigration thither dates, no doubt, from a later period, that of Alexander the Great, and of the later sovereigns, Ptolemy Lagus and Ptolemy Philadelphus. But scattered notices in the writings of the Jewish prophets make it clear that the relations between the Jewish people and Egypt became increasingly friendly, and that it was not at all unfrequent for migrations thither to take place; and it would appear, from a comparison of 1 Chron. ix. 3 with 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9, *first*, that a considerable portion of the population, from at least five tribes, retired to Jerusalem or its neighbourhood at the time of the Assyrian invasion, and thus escaped the fate of their countrymen; and *second*, that when the invading army had retired, they returned and reoccupied the country, in which they were resident in the time of Josiah; and not only so, but were in a condition to contribute to the great restoration of the Temple and its service, which was accomplished under that sovereign. Kuenen (*Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 176) says on this subject:—

'If we put all this evidence together, and examine it in connection with the further accounts by the authors in whose writings it

Digitized by Google

occurs, we arrive at the conclusion that *a very large number of Judæans remained behind in their own country.* It is true 2 Kings xxv. 12 (Jer. lii. 15) states that in 586 B.C. Nebuzaradan "left of the poor of the land to be vine-dressers and husbandmen;" or, as Jer. xxxix. 10 expresses it, "of the poor of the people, which had nothing," so that even the vineyards and fields had to be *given* to them. But it is most obvious that we must not understand this literally, but rather with great reserve. That which Jer. xl. *seq.* tells us of those who remained behind gives us the impression that they formed no despicable remnant, or, at all events, soon increased to a considerable number through the return of the fugitives from the surrounding districts. This is confirmed by Jer. lii. 30, the fresh exile in the year 581 B.C.; and further by Ezek. xxxiii. 23–29; and, finally, by the undeniable fact that the Babylonians did not send any colonists to Judæa, which they would have had to do if the land had been almost depopulated. Nor must we lose sight of the fact that the writer of 2 Kings speaks of those who remained after the *first* exile as "the poor of the land" (2 Kings xxiv. 14), and this although that remnant was numerous and powerful enough a few years later to resist Nebuchadnezzar for two years. . . . During the Babylonish exile, therefore, *many* Judeans remained in their former dwelling places.'

Having, then, established that probably about 200,000 Israelites belonging to all the tribes went into captivity, while a considerable number saved themselves for the time by flight and then resumed possession of their lands after but a brief interruption, we have next to enquire as to the Return.

At the fall of the Babylonian empire, and the rise of the Persian under Cyrus, nothing was more natural than that the latter should show a willingness to reverse the policy previously followed towards the subject nations. It might seem politic to the *parvenu* conqueror to attach to himself by kindness and clemency a widespread and powerful nationality, by permitting their return to their own land, and at the same time to buttress his newly-founded empire on the side of the great rival power of Egypt by posting across the pass between Asia and Africa a people who might feel themselves indebted to the ruling Persian power, and so be disposed to side with it in the probable event of a war with Egypt or of a rebellion within his own borders. The statement of Josephus (*Antiq.*, xi. c. 1) that Cyrus was induced to do this by having read in the prophecies of Isaiah the prediction respecting himself is well known.

The numbers of the exiles who shared in the first Return are twice stated in Scripture (Ezra ii. 64, Neh. vii. 66) as 42,360, 'beside their servants and their maids, of whom there were 7,337.' There must have been, of course, wives

Digitized by Google

and children, whose numbers are not mentioned, but would certainly be considerable. The decree, however, of Cyrus was permissive, not peremptory, and only those Israelites availed themselves of it who chose to do so.

Having carried the narrative so far, we shall have to quit the region of undisputed fact, and enter upon debatable ground. It is at this point that the Anglo-Israel theory begins to manipulate facts in order to find a standing ground. At this point, therefore, we will begin to examine whether the facts are as they are stated by its advocates. The first to which it is needful to direct attention is that the whole of the Ten Tribes went into exile, but that, unlike Judah and Benjamin, they none of them returned.

'The captivity of Israel took place about B.C. 725, *i.e.* about the eighth century before Christ. This becomes a most important fact to remember, as it brings out a most telling distinction from the Babylonish captivity of Judah, which did not take place until B.C. 588, or the sixth century before Christ. Israel's captivity was complete. "There was none left but the house of Judah only" (2 Kings xvii. 18). So complete was it that there was not a single Israelite left to teach the Gentile people who had been imported into Palestine about the God of Israel; that when these Gentiles entreated that some Israelites might return to teach them, the King of Assyria only allowed one man for the work (2 Kings xvii. 27). Whereas the Babylonish captivity of Judah was not complete, but partial, the poor of the land being left behind (Jer. xl. 7). Israel never returned (2 Kings xvii. 23). Judah did return (Neh. vii. 6).'

This is 'Identification the Second.' With more appearance of argument, Bishop Titcomb writes (*Anglo-Israel Post Bag*, p. 38):—

'In the *first* place, let me refer to Ezra ii. 1: "Now these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of those which had been carried away, whom *Nebuchadnezzar*, the King of Babylon, had *carried away unto Babylon*, and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah." You see, he makes no mention at all of the exiled Israelites. So again, in chapter iv. 1, "Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the Temple," &c. Here, again, he evidently and expressly limits the return to the two tribes, and makes no mention of the ten. It is true that in the sixth chapter, "during the reign of Darius, this old decree of Cyrus was referred to, and a fresh edict then set forth," by which new powers were given to the Jews to go on with the rebuilding of the Temple, and by which "the rest of the captivity" were permitted to go up to Jerusalem (see v. 16). But "the rest of the captivity" must surely refer to the same captivity which had been described previously, viz. the captivity of Babylon,

Digitized by Google

not of Assyria; for we know that large numbers of the Jews still remained with Daniel in the province of Babylon. I admit that these Jews are, in the verse, called "children of Israel," which at first sight may seem to imply that they came from Assyria also. But then you must remember what I showed you in my third letter, viz. that, from the time of the Israelitish exile the ten tribes were "Lo-ammi" (not My people); they were excommunicated, and not reckoned any longer as "children of Israel;" from which moment the two tribes, as in our Lord's time, alone went by that name. Thus Ezekiel, who undoubtedly prophesied to the two tribes in Babylon, everywhere calls them by the same title. Israel, therefore, in the Book of Ezra, just as in the Book of Ezekiel, must be taken as a generic title to express the covenant people of God who had returned from Babylon, and of whom Ezra was expressly speaking.

'In the *next* place, we read, in 1 Chron. v. 26, that "the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria; and He carried them away, even the Reubenites and Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them to Halah, and Habor, and Hara, to the river Gozan, *unto this day*." This was the first expatriation, when the trans-Jordanic tribes were carried captive. But, observe, the captivity continued "*unto the day*" when the 1st Book of Chronicles was written. Now, when was this? No modern critic places it before the time of Ezra or Nehemiah, while some assign it to a much later date (see the *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iii. pp. 157, 158). It is, consequently, evident that there was no known restoration of these tribes at the time of the Babylonian captivity.'

But this is by no means so certain. The restoration under Cyrus was, doubtless, distinctly Judæan. The decree specified the rebuilding of the Temple as the object of the return. This was of course to appeal to the patriotism rather of Judah and Benjamin, on whose territory Jerusalem was situated, than of the Ten Tribes at large, who had long been alienated from it, and had become subjects of the northern kingdom. The person or persons, whoever they were, who had access to Cyrus and influenced his mind, were evidently of Judah and Benjamin. So the movement was taken up by these tribes. It was headed by Jeshua the priest, who belonged, of course, to the tribe of Levi, and Zerubbabel, the representative of the royal line of David—of Judah, therefore—but who was also the *Resh galutha*, or Prince of the exiles, and so the recognized head of the Jewish settlements in the empire; and on the occasions on which they were reinforced subsequently the leaders were, again, the *Levite* Ezra, and Nehemiah, probably of Judah.

But still it can be almost certainly demonstrated that

Digitized by Google

the returning exiles were not all of Judah, but that the Ten Tribes had a share in the restoration to the fatherland. Three lists of the returned are accessible in Ezra ii., Neh. vii., 1 Esd. v., and the total given in each case is 42,360. The genealogies and numbers of the several families of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi are carefully given. But it is remarkable that these numbers, when added together, do *not* make up the total above named, but fall short of it by some 12,000 or 13,000, the actual numbers being 29,818, 31,089, 30,143. Whence this great difference? From what tribes did these 12,000 unnamed and unclassed people come? There are but two hypotheses possible—

1. That the lists were incomplete.

2. That the unnamed 12,000 were a mixed multitude out of the nine remaining tribes, who had belonged to the northern kingdom, whose genealogies were unknown to the scribe, and probably also (Ezra ii. 59) to themselves.

But (1) it is scarcely possible that the lists should have been incomplete to so great an extent. That so large a mass of family records existed shows, almost with certainty, that, far from being fragmentary and imperfectly known, the registers of the tribe of Judah had been kept with the greatest care. And bearing in mind that the numbers who had gone away seventy years before were 15,600 only, that a considerable portion of the three tribes remained still in Babylonia, and that out of the twenty-four courses of the priests only four returned, it is almost certain that the number of 30,000 out of the 42,360 that returned is intended to include all the men of the tribe of Judah to the last one; and to count the whole 42,360 as of this tribe is to introduce a critical difficulty which must render the history unintelligible. We are, then, thrown back upon the other hypothesis: these 12,000 belonged to the other nine tribes.

There are additional reasons for thinking that it was so. The multitude are distinctly called (Ezra ii. 2) 'the people [not of Judah, but] of Israel,' and similarly (vi. 16) 'the children of Israel, the priests and the Levites.' They dedicate the Temple as if they had a right to represent the Twelve Tribes, and sacrifice (vi. 17), 'for a sin offering for all Israel, twelve he goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel.' Somewhat later there is demonstrative evidence that great numbers of Israelites were settled in every part of the land of Israel (Macc. v. *passim*); 'a very great host' they are in one place called. To complete here the evidence we

Digitized by Google

have to adduce on this point, there was certainly one person not of Judah at Jerusalem in our Lord's time, viz. 'Anna the prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser' (S. Luke ii. 36).

All these facts may be taken as establishing that great numbers of Israelites belonging to the nine tribes returned to their own land at the time that Judah and Benjamin returned and on subsequent occasions.

In the next place, starting from the fact, which is contested by no one, that a great number, probably the majority, of Israelites remained in Babylonia and Chaldæa, which had become the lands of their adoption, we shall endeavour to show that these communities retained a distinct existence until very long after the time at which we have arrived in our examination: so late, indeed, as almost to negative the idea of their being in any real sense *lost.* It will be remembered that the Anglo-Israelite theory is that the masses of Israelites who remained in Chaldæa and Assyria disappear from the view of history at or soon after the return of Judah, B.C. 536, and reappear as the Beth-Khumri, or Sacæ (Saxons), about B.C. 450 or B.C. 500, having, during the interval, not only wholly changed their religion and become idolaters, but having lost also their national traditions, in exchange for which they had acquired purely Aryan ones, and even their Semitic features and cast of countenance, *all the while retaining their pure Jewish blood.*

It would be easy to retort that this part of the theory is inconsistent with itself. A race may, no doubt, retain its identity, its special cast of features, its peculiar customs and traditions, for long periods even though surrounded by another race; but it does so by resisting the tendency to fusion by intermarriage and by refusing to be merged in the peoples around it. But it cannot be at once the same and not the same. A theory is altogether unphilosophical which says in one breath that the ten tribes were merged in the common heathenism, and in the mass of Aryan populations in Media and the surrounding countries, and in the next breath asserts that such and such a nation, *Sakai* or what not, which pushed westward, are the *ten tribes* in their own proper persons. After the submersion described of this single stock in the much larger body by which it was surrounded, there would no longer be any ten tribes to reappear; and the statements are directly contradictory. Of such ill-cemented materials is this theory composed. But we must return to our argument. We say, then, that the Israelites who re-

Digitized by Google

mained in the East remained long in distinct and *recognizable* bodies, and could not therefore be the subjects of this marvellous transformation which is asserted.

Take, first, the statements of Josephus, which have for this period, as they have hardly for earlier ones, a certain consistency and historical weight.

He states that Antiochus the Great (223–187 B.C.) caused 2,000 Jewish families, with their effects, to be transferred from Mesopotamia and the province of Babylon into Lydia and Phrygia, in the hope that they would prove contented settlers and loyal to his authority. It was the traditional policy of the Seleucidæ to favour the Asiatic Jews. Seleucus Nicator gave them the right of citizenship in those cities which he built in Asia, and in Antioch itself. Antiochus surnamed *Theos* extended the privilege to Ionian cities, exciting great jealousy among the native inhabitants by so doing (*Ant.* xii. c. 3, 4). It is probable that, favoured and encouraged as they thus were, they spread over a great part of Asia Minor, and thence crossed over into Europe. To these settlers may be with great probability referred the graves in the Crimea, with Hebrew inscriptions, which are referred to by Bishop Titcomb (*Anglo-Israël Post Bag*, p. 21). With all this there remained a vast Israelite population in the East. The city Nisibis was entirely inhabited by them. Neerda was for a time the seat of a purely Jewish kingdom (*Ant.* xviii. 9), which was so powerful as to contend on equal terms with Mithridates the Parthian. We leave Egypt out of the question, though it is certain that large numbers of Israelites emigrated thither, and that from very early times, even before the Captivity.

And these Jews while preserving their identity preserved also their religion. It is certain, from Acts ii. 9, that there were still existing Jewish communities in Parthia, Media, Elam, *i.e.* dwelling on the Persian Gulf (Polybius, xxxi. 11, calls the country Ἐλυμαΐς),[1] and in Mesopotamia, *i.e.* in the very countries to which the Ten Tribes had been carried, from which countries there were representatives present at the celebration of the Passover in Jerusalem; and who therefore were still adherents of the Mosaic religion. And certainly S. Paul, at all events, had no conception (Acts xxvi. 7), if we are to judge from his own declaration, that ten of the tribes to whom he appealed with such confidence had utterly apostatized, and were lost beyond recognition by blending with the

[1] See also a reference in Tobit ii. 10.

Digitized by Google

populations around them. Even at the present day traces, such as they are, exist in the East of Hebrew blood in more than one people. The claim set up by the Afghans, which is supported by linguistic affinities far less questionable than those adduced in the publications before us, is well known. In India there are large numbers of persons who call themselves the *Beni Israel*, and refuse to be designated *Jehudim*, or 'Jews.' They have only those parts of the Hebrew Scriptures that were written before the Captivity; nor do they observe *Purim*, nor the dedication festival of the Temple, nor the commemoration of its destruction, *all of which were, of course, instituted after the Captivity*. The 'white' and 'black' Jews, so called, of Malabar number, probably, not less than half a million souls. Certainly the existence of the *Diaspora*, or Dispersion, in 'the four ends of the earth' (*Shemoneh Esra*) was a well-known fact to the Jews at all times; but there is not a word in their records, that we know of, to indicate their knowledge of any apostasy *en masse*; and it seems impossible that so portentous a fact as the wholesale desertion of the ancestral religion by three-fourths of the entire nation should leave no trace whatever on the literature of the remaining fourth.

It is true that Josephus does in one passage of his *Antiquities* make a statement which may be quoted as meaning that none of the Ten Tribes returned from Media; and this passage is accordingly displayed with great triumph by the advocates of this view. But an examination of the context at once shows that all the writer meant to assert was that the great body of the people of Israel, unlike the great body of the *two* tribes, Judah and Benjamin, remained in Media, although *a great many* returned. But we had better quote the entire passage, of which the Anglo-Israelite pamphleteers only bring forward the last half-dozen lines:—

"When Esdras had received this epistle he was very joyful, and began to worship God, and confessed that he had been the cause of the king's great favour to him, and that for the same reason he gave all the thanks to God. So he read the epistle at Babylon to those Jews that were there; but he kept the epistle itself, and sent a copy of it to all those of his own nation that were in Media; and when these Jews had understood what piety the king had towards God, and what kindness he had for Esdras, they were all greatly pleased; nay many of them took their effects with them, and came to Babylon, as very desirous of going down to Jerusalem; but then the entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country; wherefore there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the Ten Tribes are beyond Euphrates, till now, and are an

Digitized by Google

immense multitude, and not to be estimated by numbers."—*Antiq.* B. xi. c. 5, p. 2.

It is time, however, to sum up this long and tedious inquiry, and to see how the case stands, on the whole, with reference to the Anglo-Israel theory, as far as historical evidence is concerned. We have, then, rendered at least very probable—

(*a*) That the number of Israelites, men and women, belonging to the Tribes, who were deported, first and last, from their own country to Assyria and Babylonia, may be computed with a fair degree of probability at 200,000.

(*b*) That a considerable number evaded the proscription by taking refuge in the kingdom of Judah, at that time unconquered; that these, after the retirement of the hostile army, went back to their homes, and so retained a foothold in the country; and also that the beginnings of emigration to Egypt can even as early as this be perceived. Those who had proceeded thither of course also escaped the Assyrians.

(*c*) That the return under Ezra, though principally composed of members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, was not exclusively so, but that probably a fourth of the whole number may have belonged to the Ten Tribes.

(*d*) That, far from undergoing a rapid process of absorption, the Israelites who remained in Assyria and Babylonia constituted, for a long period of time, well-defined communities, exclusively of their own race, which were repeatedly recognized and favoured by one sovereign after another.

(*e*) The records show that they spread throughout the East, still remaining a distinct people, as far west as the coasts of Asia Minor fronting upon Europe, and as far East as Persia, Mesopotamia, and India.

(*f*) That these scattered communities preserved also their religion, in a form perhaps somewhat mingled with ethnic elements.

If these propositions have been established, as we believe, then it would seem that the peculiar theory on which we are commenting is thereby so conclusively disproved that there is little object in further argument. It should be remembered that it claims to be primarily a statement of historical facts, to be therefore judged by historical evidence; and that the witness of history, so far as it can be ascertained, is, as we have seen, uniformly unfavourable to the theory. Therefore its interpretation of passages in the prophetical books of Scripture must be considered to be discredited beforehand. Nor is the practice of 'proving' this or that position by the mere citation of texts of Scripture torn from their context, and

Digitized by Google

made to mean something very different from their original intention, at all commendable. The reading public are tolerably well acquainted with the practice nevertheless; but we think that the treatment of Scripture by the enthusiastic Anglo-Israelite writers surpasses all that we had previously met with.

In the first place, the great distinction between 'Israel' and 'Judah,' upon which the entire theory is founded, appears to us to be by no means uniformly maintained; and the inference drawn from it to be a sheer mistake. The idea is that a degree of favour was intended towards the Ten Tribes by God which was not extended to the two, and that the promises of future blessing and restoration, which are found in almost all the prophets, apply to the former, not at all to the latter, and are to be temporally, not spiritually, understood. This is Mr. Hine's view:—

'When God, in prophecy, speaks to the house of Israel, He does not refer to the Jews; and when He refers to Judah, it is generally as distinct from Israel. Yet it is a most common mistake with Biblical students to think that when God speaks to the house of Israel He always refers to the Jews. Even among themselves, when an Israelite is spoken of, the conclusion is jumped at directly that a Jew is referred to. Every intelligent Jew will readily confess that the ten tribes are not now among their people. A Jewish scholar told me recently that not only do the Jews know these tribes to be lost, but they firmly believe that, wherever they are, a descendant from David is reigning over them. The house of Judah is composed of two tribes, *i.e.* Judah and Levi. These are the Jews of the present day. They never have been lost, it being the desire of the Almighty that they should be known, wherever they go, by all people.

'At the time of the separation, and up to the siege of Jerusalem under Titus, the house of Judah contained the tribe of Benjamin; but that tribe separated from Judah before the siege, by virtue of the prophecy commanding them to do so (Jer. vi. 1), so that Benjamin is not now with the Jews. Indeed, it is almost unpardonable to allude to the Jews as embodying Judah and Benjamin, though it is an error commonly made. The term Ephraim is synonymous with Israel, and embodies the ten tribes as a consolidated people. Manasseh is a thirteenth tribe, decreed by the Almighty to be "a great people," *i.e.* a distinct nationality; nevertheless Ephraim was to "be greater than he" (Gen. xlviii. 19), that is, a distinct nationality from Manasseh, so that it testifies of ignorance to include Manasseh as one of the ten tribes. Ephraim and Manasseh must be two distinct nations, though of the same stock. Therefore, in seeking for lost Israel, we need not deal with Manasseh for the present.

'The Jews are "of Israel," therefore purely Israelites; but the people of the ten tribes were never Jews. This is an important dis-

Digitized by Google

tinction to bear in mind. Scripture often speaks of Judah under the term of Israelites, specially the prophet Ezekiel; yet when this term is applied to Judah, and it becomes needful to distinguish the ten tribes from her, it is done by using the terms "all Israel," "the whole house of Israel," "the house of Israel wholly." These terms are copyright to Israel, and are never applied to Judah.'—*Forty-seven Identifications*, p. 2.

This is at all events positive enough. But an examination of the instances in which the terms 'Judah,' 'Israel,' are used, will show that it is utterly incorrect. The term 'Israel,' 'Israelite,' is a generic one. It is the name of the *nation*, whereas Judah is the name of a tribe merely. But this tribe was a part of the nation; and in the earlier prophets it will be found that Judah is *always* included under the term Israel. Subsequently the usage becomes complicated by the fact that the one term was appropriated as the name of the northern kingdom, and the other of the southern, which included the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. Even then it will be often found either that the old usage was continued or that the two terms are employed as synonymous. We will give an example of each usage:—

1. Israel as *including* Judah:—'The children of Ammon passed over Jordan to fight also against Judah and against Benjamin, and against the house of Ephraim, so that *Israel* was sore distressed.'—Judg. x. 9.

2. Israel as *equivalent* to Judah:—'In Judah is God known: His name is great in Israel.'—Ps. lxxvi. 1.

3. Distinct usage, after the disruption:—'Rehoboam went out against Israel.'—2 Chron. xi. 1. 'The children of Israel fled before Judah.'—2 Chron. xiii. 16.

In the prophetical writings the older usage is generally to be discerned, *e.g.* 'The vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of *Israel*, and the men of *Judah* his pleasant plant' (Is. v. 7), where the one term, as before, includes the other; and this must be taken to be the sense of prophecies, when there is nothing in the context to contradict it.

Similarly in the New Testament generally 'Israel' is used as including *all* the tribes, as in Rom. x. 1 (comp. x. 12, xi. 1), but occasionally as a convertible term with 'Judah' and 'Jews,' as in Rom. ix. 24, where the writer, S. Paul, speaks of 'us Jews,' though he was actually a Benjamite. And this was the common vernacular habit of speech, as may be seen in Matt. viii. 10, ix. 33, Luke ii. 34, which show conclusively that the Palestinian Jews of our Lord's time had no hesitation in calling themselves *Israel*, as, according to this theory,

Digitized by Google

they had no right whatever to do; and furthermore, that the same all important term (as this theory considers it) was applied to them by our Lord Himself. Much more testimony might be obtained from the Scriptures, if needed; but it is so evident to our mind that the argument from Scripture utterly breaks down upon examination, that we need not pursue the matter further.

There remains the somewhat vague philological argument; and though we do not intend to examine all the scraps of strange tongues wherewith the advocates of this theory are wont to impart a semblance of solidity to their airy fictions, yet it may be worth while to test one or two of the assertions made of this kind, and to judge by these of the importance of the rest. We learn, then, that

'it is an undeniable historical fact that about B.C. 580,[1] the very time of the Babylonian captivity, that a princess from the East did arrive in the north of Ireland. Her name was Tephi, purely a Hebrew word, a proof in itself that she must have had Eastern extraction; and she was accompanied by a guardian known as the Ollam Fola, another Hebrew word, showing Eastern origin, and which means a revealer, which is the same as a prophet. This prophet was accompanied also by one Brug, no doubt Baruch, because Jeremiah and Baruch were undoubtedly together from this time. Many new things were introduced into that part of Ireland of a clear Hebrew origin; thus the name of the place, *Lothair Grofinn*, was changed to Tara (*Taura*), a Hebrew word signifying the law of the two tables. The *mur ollamain* was established Hebrew for college of *ollams*, or school of the prophets. The *iodhan moran* was created, also Hebrew for a chief justice; the *rectaire*, Hebrew for the judge.'—*Forty-seven Identifications*, p. 32.

This is all very wonderful and imposing, in more than one sense, and no doubt that the unlearned reader, who has vaguely heard somewhere or other of 'the harp that once in Tara's halls,' but has no distinct idea where Tara was, is impressed with the persuasion that he is on the verge of a great discovery. But we should doubt whether the writer has been correctly informed or has fully apprehended what was told to him.

For example, the Hebrew word *thora* (תּוֹרָה) was applied to *the law of Moses* and to nothing else.

To suppose that an Israelite would call a village, or even a palace, *the Law*, is simply ridiculous. *Tara* is with more

[1] The Babylonian captivity commenced with the capture of Jerusalem B.C. 597. But of what consequence is a gap of seventeen years? Did not Æneas traverse the Mediterranean for seven years after the fall of Troy before he landed in Italy?

Digitized by Google

of probability to be referred to *tarbh* or *tairbh*, a root which the ancient Irish shares with the Cornish, Armorican, Runic, and six or seven other languages. *Lothar* or *lothair* means an assembly. Then *ollamh* is a learned man, and *mur ollamh*, though it generally denotes simply a school, may conceivably be rendered 'school of the prophets.' But the Hebrew word is altogether different, being נָבִיא (nâbi), or רֹאֶה (roēh), or even חֹזֶה (chozeh). *Iodhanmoran* is unintelligible to us in the meaning assigned. The substantive *iodhan* denotes a spear, while the adjective of the same form means sincere or pure. The word for a justice—that is, a judge—on the contrary, is *breiyth*. *Rectaire* is not Irish at all, though there is a word, *riaghaltair*, which denotes a ruler or governor. *Dan* or *Danai*, again, in which Bishop Titcomb[1] (*Anglo-Israel Post Bag*, p. 44) is adventurous enough to see a reference to the tribe of Dan, which he holds to have settled in Ireland, is more probably either the Gaelic *dàn*, *dana*, bold, daring; or less probably the Irish *danair*, a stranger, foreigner, or guest. The root is a common one. But perhaps we are spending unnecessary time over these truly remarkable 'Identifications,' and the reader has fully made up his mind about them. On the nonsense put forward in some of the tracts by way of proof—*e.g.* that 'England has colonies,' that these 'encompass the earth and displace the previous inhabitants,' 'must have the emblems of the lion and the unicorn,' &c.—we do not waste words. That which affronts common sense does not require formal refutation. But the romance which is also gravely narrated as a part of the theory is far too amusing to be passed over. Indeed, we suspect that it is the most attractive part of the literature of the movement to the majority of those who follow it. There is a latent love for the marvellous in most people, and this has been indulged to the top of its bent by

[1] Since writing the above, a story has come to us from Rangoon of a lecture delivered by this gentleman upon the subject of 'The Saxons in India,' in which he seriously put forth the Anglo-Israelite theory that Gautama (*Sakya-muni*), the founder and great deity of the Burmese religion, was of the race of the *Sacæ* or Saxons, *i.e.* virtually of the English race; and claimed consideration for the Christian religion upon that ground from the followers of Gautama in Burmah: a strange ground indeed for a Christian Bishop to rely upon; nor can we wonder at the burst of Homeric laughter with which the theory was received by the European community there. The occurrence has since been reported by the Bishop himself in his book (*Personal Recollections of British Burma*, p. 47), and he expresses some surprise, which we do not think his readers will share, that 'whereas two gentlemen promised to follow me with other lectures, not one promise was fulfilled.'

Digitized by Google

the fictions we are about to describe. Our readers have probably seen, or at least heard of, the ancient 'coronation stone' used at the coronation of our sovereigns, and preserved in Westminster Abbey. About this the Anglo-Israelite *littérateurs* have woven a most astonishing web of incident, which perhaps sufficiently accounts for the popularity of their theory. Everybody who had looked into the history of this interesting 'monument of the Empire,' as Dean Stanley in his history of the Abbey terms it, was well aware that the stone in question had endured very remarkable fortunes. Its early history is Irish; and it is probably a monument of the days of Druidic ascendency in that island.

Under the hands of the Anglo-Israelites, however, it becomes a marvellous relic of antiquity indeed, nothing less than the stone which Jacob used for his pillow when he slept at Luz (Gen. xxviii. 2).[1] This stone is said to have been in the Temple of Solomon, and to have been brought thence by the prophet Jeremiah and conveyed to Ireland. The tale is told with a boldness of conception and an unhesitating affluence of detail almost worthy of Defoe. It is hard to understand a man who is not professedly writing fiction, *romancing* in this audacious fashion. So intimately acquainted is the author of this veracious history with the circumstances of the transaction, that he is able to state that the ship which carried the stone was disabled on the coast of Spain. Then he proceeds to narrate, as if the events had taken place last year and had been reported in the *Times*, that 'the "King of Spain," hearing it was a ship of goodly store, seized the stone' (naturally, as stones were scarce and valuable property in those days); whoever may be meant by the King of Spain, there being no such person at that time. But the next incident is wonderfully funny. 'When the ship was properly caulked, two men, Jeremiah and Baruch, regained the stone, made off with it to the ship, and escaped.' Probably we are to understand that they carried it off in their pockets.[2] Having arrived in Ireland, it immediately became the *lia phail*,

[1] 'It is impossible to suppose that Jacob's stone can be actually lost, because it must exist as a signet ring to the Almighty, i.e. as a seal of witness that the promises He made to Israel through Jacob should be verified; therefore, wherever Israel may be at the present time, they must have this stone in their possession. Jacob was out late at night, too late to enter the city of Luz, the gates of the city, like our Temple Bar and other gates found in nearly every town, being shut. He had to stay outside, took a stone, laid his head upon it, and slept.'—*Forty-seven Identifications*, p. 33.

[2] Notwithstanding that it must be of several tons weight.

Digitized by Google

or stone of fate, upon which the highest kings of Ireland were crowned. Sober antiquarians, however, (that is, if antiquarians, and especially Irish antiquarians, are ever sober,) consider that the stone in question and the uses to which it was put were due to the Druids, and are to be referred to their time. It certainly was removed to Scotland, in A.D. 842, by Kenneth II.; under what circumstances is not known to the world, unless the Anglo-Israelite romancer aforesaid is able to inform mankind. What is apparently well ascertained is that it was popularly considered to guarantee the continuance of a Scottish dynasty wherever it was preserved. This belief, however, is not, it would seem, as old as the times of the Druids, but is of later growth; though Toland thinks otherwise, and has preserved the following ancient quatrain in the Irish language in proof:—

'Cioniodh scuit saor an fine,
Man ba breag an faisdine
Mar a bh' fhuignid an lia fàil,
Dlighid flaitneas do ghabhail,'

which is to be rendered: 'Unless the fates deceive, wherever this stone is placed the Scots must rule.' And we are gravely invited to see in the fact that this stone is now deposited in Westminster Abbey an 'identity;' or, to quote the *Forty-seven Identifications*, 'its history is historical, giving us another of the very many historical proofs we possess in proof of our identity.'

We almost feel that we owe an apology to those who may read these pages for occupying their attention with such assertions as these. Our justification for so doing is that large numbers of persons read and believe them; and not merely so, but grow enthusiastic in their defence, and spend time, trouble, and such ability as they possess in disseminating them through the periodical and newspaper press. Possibly this Anglo-Israelite craze may prove to be a merely ephemeral wave of opinion, which will run its course and then subside as rapidly as it has risen. Experience, however, does not encourage us to be too hopeful in that direction. This theory, harmless as it may seem, is by no means without its dangers. It has the semblance of a religion, but is, as far as we are enabled to judge, without any such constraining moral power as would enable it to exercise any control over the heart and life. It is found to weaken the hold of practical religion over its adherents, without giving them anything in its place. The reader may well enquire in

Digitized by Google

what way, if the entire theory of Anglo-Israelism should be granted, the newly-discovered Israelites would be influenced for the better. Will it, he would probably ask, supply one motive to exertion in which Christianity is deficient? Will it remove a single difficulty to moral effort, or place the individual or the nation in a more favourable position in any way whatever? Can it even be said that it conduces to the fulfilment of the prophecies of Scripture, as is loudly claimed by some of its advocates? We have already seen that its theory of the meaning of these very prophecies goes upon an assumption about their intention which is to the last degree doubtful and disputable, if it be not demonstrably false; while even if it were accurate, it is obvious that the Divine purposes concerning the tribes of Israel, whatever they may be, will be fulfilled quite independently of the assistance of men, and that in supposing we have penetrated the secret of their fulfilment we are much more likely to be rushing to hasty and premature conclusions. 'No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation' is a warning principle which was never more needed than in our own times. We may safely leave the Divine governor of the moral universe alone to mature His designs, without a premature and futile attempt at scrutinizing them. In such theories of the Divine doings, man, like an ignorant guide,

> 'is sure to err
> And scan His work in vain;
> God is His own interpreter:'

a sentiment which we commend to the attention of those who are engrossed in the propagation of what vaunts itself almost as a new Evangel, to the exclusion of the old.

So long as these enthusiasts are surrounded by the powerful organizations of the Christian Church, the moral sense of the community will no doubt keep the movement in check; but still a system based upon hypotheses, doubtful and precarious to the last degree, even if not on error and falsity, is a moral miasm; it tends to perpetuate erroneous methods of exegesis and disingenuous ways of dealing with evidence, of which the mischief does not cease with their first employment. It does not appear to us, therefore, a system with which clergymen can safely coquet, and we regret to see the names of not a few connected with the movement. There are surely abundant fields in which their fancy may expatiate, without their laying violent hands on philology and physiology, not to speak of their turning history into legend, and legend

Digitized by Google

into history, in order to substitute a literal and physical fulfilment of these prophecies for the ideal and typical one which the Christian Church has always from the earliest times held and taught.

ART. III.—SEPULCHRAL MONUMENTS OF THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE.

1. *Sepulchral Monuments in Italy.* (Arundel Society: London, 1878).
2. *History of Sculpture from the Earliest Ages to the Present Day.* By Dr. WILHELM LÜBKE. (London, 1872.)
3. *Tuscan Sculptors: their Lives, Works, and Times.* By C. C. PERKINS. (London, 1864.)
4. *Geschichte der bildenden Künste.* Von Dr. KARL SCHNAASE. (Düsseldorf, 1843–64.)
5. *The Stones of Venice.* By JOHN RUSKIN. (London, 1853–55.)

THE saying that the history of the human race might be written by the aid of tombs applies in an especial sense to the Italian Renaissance. Nowhere better can we trace the whole course of the movement, its rise, progress, and decadence, than in the sepulchral monuments which fill the churches and convents of Italy. Beautiful in themselves as works of art, interesting as the highest expression of Christian thought to which sculpture has ever attained, these memorials of the dead have an historic value independent of their artistic merit. In them we see reflected the social life of Renaissance Italy, and are brought face to face with the actors in those contemporary chronicles so rich in picturesque and startling contrasts, where dark tales of bloodshed and treachery appear together with the most refined culture, or some vein of hidden tenderness surprises us in the career of a despot who has worked untold misery to his country. As we watch the princely riders, set high up above the din and stir of men, on the open square of Verona, or pace the aisles where scholars and Doges rest, we realize more vividly than ever before the conditions of the age to which these heroes of a bygone time belonged. And in this long file of 'mighty dead' every variety of character is represented. Warrior, prelate, poet, each passes before us in turn; and not only public men, but

Digitized by Google

the presences which hallow the more sheltered paths of life, the wife who shared her husband's counsel, the child torn by an early death from a parent's arms—these, too, have their effigies, and receive their share of funeral honours. Can Grande, Lionardo Salutati, Gaston de Foix, Ilaria, and Medea Colleoni are so many living types of the moral and intellectual ideals of their times, which the sculptor's art has caught and fixed for ever in marble.

Thus to scholar, historian, and art-student alike these tombs are objects of the greatest interest, and the Arundel Society has earned a new claim on our gratitude by the illustrated series of Sepulchral Monuments which it has recently issued. The publication consists of seven parts, each containing as many photographs of well-known tombs taken by Mr. Stephen Thompson, and accompanied by short descriptions, which he has also supplied. The illustrations themselves are admirable specimens of photography; and in several cases portions of the finest monuments have been judiciously enlarged, as, for instance, that of the Cardinal of Portugal in San Miniato, and of Ilaria di Carretto, at Lucca, familiar to all Englishmen from Mr. Ruskin's description.[1]

All we have to regret is that the scope of the work should not have been larger, and that many of the finest monuments in Italy are necessarily excluded from the series. Venice, richest of all Italian cities in tombs, is not represented by a single specimen, and we look in vain for the effigy of the young Roman, Marco Albertoni, for Mino's greatest work, the Bishop's monument at Fiesole, or for the tomb of Medea Colleoni, which has recently acquired almost as deserved a celebrity as Ilaria's, from the notice of another eloquent writer.[2] A continuation of the series at some future time will, we hope, supply these omissions; and meanwhile we cordially wish the work a wide circulation, and this new undertaking of the Society all the success it deserves.

For the origin of Italian sepulchral monuments we must go back to the Catacombs, where the beginning of this, as of other branches of Christian art, are to be found. We know that from the earliest ages the loving care of the dead had been a natural sentiment, and that long before the Christian era the different nations of antiquity had brought the arts of sculpture and painting to assist in the decoration of the tomb.

[1] The work is also to include an introductory essay on 'Italian Sepulchral Monuments,' by Mr. G. E. Street, R.A., which has not yet appeared, but which will no doubt add greatly to the interest of the series.

[2] Mr. John Addington Symonds.

Digitized by Google

Artemisia, Queen of Caria, had employed the first artists of Greece to make her husband's sepulchre the wonder of the world; the Pharaohs had their Pyramids, the Cæsars their mausoleums. The Greeks, for the most part, adorned their tombs with the simple incidents of domestic life—as, for instance, a boy at his mother's knee, or a girl combing her mistress's hair—without reference to the gloom of the grave, or the hope of another world. In the more elaborate compositions on their larger sarcophagi, the battle of the Amazons, the Calydonian hunt, or siege of Troy, the subjects chosen are usually marked by the same absence of special meaning. If allusion is made to death at all, it is simply as departure. Charon ferries souls across the Styx, and the parting of friends is expressed by the clasped hands which we find on Greek and Etruscan tombs, or the retreating figure looking backwards with lingering regret, loth to leave the pleasant earth.

But with Christianity the grave had won a new meaning. All the deepest truths of Christ's teaching combined to make the thought of death one of supreme importance. The Christian closed his eyes on this world in serene and joyous confidence, looking forward to the return of his Master and the day of resurrection. To him death was not only the end of trial and suffering, but the beginning of a new and higher life in union with his Lord and with all who had gone before. Accordingly, everywhere in the rude art of the Catacombs we find manifold expression given to this 'hope full of immortality.'

The monogram of Christ, the palm of victory, the Good Shepherd, the vine, peacock, and the many other symbols on early Christian sarcophagi, all point to this sure hope in a risen Lord which had conquered death and shorn the grave of its worst terrors. For long, indeed, jealousy of Pagan idolatry restrained Christian sculptors to the simplest symbolism, but gradually their range widened, and the different incidents of the life of Christ, His miracles, parables, or Old Testament subjects chosen with distinct reference to Our Lord as the Resurrection and the Life, became common. Occasionally portrait-busts of the deceased are introduced in the hollow of a shell, and frequently the figure of a man or woman with hands raised in prayer. The compartments are divided by small pillars; and, prominent among those features which were to be reproduced in later tombs is the *arcosolium*, or arched recess in the wall above the sarcophagus, originally intended to admit of the celebration of the Christian mysteries, and afterwards developed into the canopy which forms an

Digitized by Google

important part of mediæval and Renaissance monuments. The ten marble sarcophagi of the Archbishops of Ravenna still existing in the noble Basilica of S. Apollinare in Classe, adorned with every variety of Christian symbol in the shape of crosses, lyres, peacocks, doves, vines, palms, lambs, and rivers of Paradise, show that this style of decoration remained in use as late as the eighth century. With the decay of Roman civilization sculpture became ruder, until every trace of ornament disappeared from the surface of tombs, and when, in the thirteenth century, some feeling for art revived, heathen sarcophagi were frequently used as burial-places for illustrious personages.

Tradition says that one of these, a tomb now preserved in the Campo Santo of Pisa, and bearing reliefs from the history of Hippolytus and Phædra, first gave Niccola Pisano the impulse which was to quicken art into new life. This great man, whose genius paved the way for all future progress, was called to Bologna, immediately after completing his famous baptistery pulpit, to sculpture a sarcophagus for the remains of S. Dominic, who had died there in 1221. The reliefs which Niccola executed for this Arca, especially the well-known scene of the youth killed by a fall from his horse and restored to life by the Saint, are admirable examples of the truth and beauty of form which he was the first to revive. But, while the Arca gives evidence of the new principles which he had struck out, Niccola did not effect any important change in the form of sepulchral monuments, and it was reserved to a scholar of his to create a type which should find universal acceptance in the Pisan school. That scholar was Arnolfo del Cambio, the man to whom Florence owes her Duomo, her Palazzo Vecchio, and many more of the finest churches within her gates. With the love of Gothic architecture which had inspired these creations strong within his breast, he came to Orvieto in the last decades of the thirteenth century, and designed the tomb of Cardinal Guillaume de Braye, in the Dominican church of that city.

In old Etruscan and Roman sarcophagi it had been the custom to represent the figures of the dead half erect in a sitting or reclining posture, as if assisting at a banquet or conversing with friends, as closely as possible resembling what they had been in life. The Christian idea of death, on the contrary, was that of calm and deep sleep, only to be broken by the Archangel's trump, and this new conception had already been embodied in the rude recumbent figures which appear on thirteenth-century tombs. Arnolfo saw the beauty of this

Digitized by Google

idea, and made full use of it. On a sarcophagus adorned with mosaics he carved the figure of the Cardinal in robes and mitre, reposing as it were in the silence of his last sleep, with two angels standing at the head and foot, drawing back the folds of a curtain and watching over the dead man's rest. But if the body of the Christian for whom this world's troubles are ended sleeps guarded by angels till the resurrection morning, his soul has entered on the life of the blessed in Paradise. This, too, Arnolfo represented. Above the effigy, under a Gothic tabernacle supported by twisted columns, he placed a majestic Virgin royally enthroned and crowned, with the Holy Child in her arms, and S. Dominic presenting the kneeling Cardinal to them.

Such was the original type which, first conceived by Arnolfo, became at one time general throughout Italy, and with certain modifications remained in use during the two centuries following. The beauty and appropriate nature of the design caused it to be immediately adopted by many living sculptors. Niccola's son, Giovanni Pisano, turned it to admirable account in his monument of Pope Benedict XI., who died at Perugia in 1305, from eating poisoned figs given him at the instigation of Philip the Fair of France. Vasari tells us how, while on a visit to his old friend Arnolfo at Florence, where he had seen the rising walls of the Duomo, and admired the genius of the young Giotto, Giovanni was summoned to Perugia by the French King's partisan, Cardinal Acquasparta, to erect a tomb in memory of the Pope, who had fallen a victim to his intrigues. In this magnificent work the leading motives of Cardinal de Braye's tomb are repeated on a grander scale, and treated with all the passionate feeling and animation which mark the Pisan sculptor's productions. The lofty canopy is supported by pillars encrusted with mosaic and inlaid with fantastically entwined figures. Rosettes and arabesques adorn the lower basement, and statues of Apostles are introduced on the upper story below the Virgin and Saints, while the curtain-drawing angels look down on the dead man with wondering pathos on their faces.

The influence of these two men extended, even in their lifetime, beyond the limits of Tuscany. At Padua, Giovanni Pisano executed the tomb of Enrico Scrovegno, illustrious as the founder of Giotto's chapel; and whether or not Arnolfo supplied the design for Boniface VIII.'s tomb in the crypt of S. Peter's, his type of monument was adopted by the Roman artists, known as the Cosmati, and the Gothic forms which he had introduced took the place of the round arches

Digitized by Google

they had hitherto used. In the same way the tomb of Gregory X. at Arezzo, selected for the first of the Arundel photographs, bears strong marks of Pisan influence. It was probably designed by a pupil of Niccola's school, and is very unlikely to be the work of Margaritone, to whom Mr. Thompson, following Vasari, ascribes it, and who, as Crowe and Cavalcaselle remark, was too bad a painter to be a good sculptor. Naples, where Giovanni Pisano and Arnolfo both spent several years at the Court of Charles of Anjou, boasted from this time a succession of Tuscan artists, and the tombs of the Angevin Kings in Sta. Chiara are all fashioned on the Pisan type, with statues often gaudily coloured to suit Neapolitan taste, and black marble backgrounds, against which the figures stand out with singular effect. Of greater importance was the Sienese school, whose artists produced several excellent sepulchral monuments. One of these is the sarcophagus now in the Campo Santo of Pisa, sculptured by Tino da Camaino, to hold the ashes of Henry VII., who, dying suddenly on the plains of Monte Aperto, was interred in the city which he had protected. The Emperor, whom Dante had called upon to give back peace to Italy, is represented bareheaded, wearing his imperial mantle embroidered with lions and eagles. Mourning angels without curtain or canopy stand at each end, and eleven short and awkward figures of Saints adorn the base. Another tomb, interesting as the first of the professorial monuments afterwards common in Italy, is that of the poet and learned commentator of Justinian, Cino da Pistoja, who, like his friend Dante, was driven into exile by a political faction, and on whose death Petrarch wrote the sonnet, 'Piangete, donne, e con voi pianga amore.' His ashes rest in the Duomo of his own fair city, from which he was so long banished, and a bas-relief on his tomb represents him lecturing to his pupils, among whom is the beautiful Selvaggia, whose praises he celebrated, and whose early death he deplored in the sonnets which made him illustrious.

As the sculptor advanced in technical skill and knowledge, the custom of recording the deeds of the dead in reliefs along the base of the tomb became common. A striking instance may be seen in the monument of Guido Tarlati, where below the recumbent effigy and curtain-drawing angels sixteen reliefs represent the principal events of the warrior-bishop's life. His entry into Arezzo, the fortification and storming of the city, the coronation of the Emperor with the Iron Crown of Lombardy by the excommunicated prelate's hand, are all graphically depicted with a dramatic vigour that reminds us

Digitized by Google

of Giovanni Pisano. The figures of the horsemen, although rudely carved, are full of knightly bearing, and the weeping women, tearing their hair, and wringing their hands, in the Bishop's death-scene are excellent in attitude and expression. The joint authors of this monument were two Sienese sculptors, Agostino di Giovanni and Agnolo di Ventura, whose work on the Duomo at Orvieto attracted Giotto's attention, and led him to recommend them to Piero Saccone, Guido's brother, for the execution of the Bishop's tomb.

The influence which the great painter himself exercised on all contemporary art is visible in Tarlati's monument, and becomes still more conspicuous in the work of Andrea Pisano and his followers. What Niccola had done for painting, Giotto now gave back to sculpture. From him Tuscan sculptors learnt nobility of form, simplicity and clearness of composition. They adopted the flowing lines of his drapery, and frequently availed themselves of the types which he had introduced. This Giottesque manner strikes us particularly in the work of Andrea's pupil, Balduccio, who, recommended to Azzo Visconti by Castruccio Castracani, despot of Lucca, went to Milan in 1339, and became the founder of an important school of sculpture. Here, in the Church of San Eustorgio, he was employed to raise a monument to San Pietro Martire, the Dominican friar and preacher, whose tragic death is the theme of Bellini's and Titian's masterpieces. This elaborate work consists of a richly carved sarcophagus, adorned with scenes from the friar's life, and supported by eight pillars, in front of which are allegorical statues of virtues. Above, under a Gothic tabernacle, are the Virgin and Child receiving S. Pietro Martire into heaven, while a figure of Christ between two adoring angels crowns the topmost story and completes the whole. The execution of the bas-reliefs is inferior, but the allegorical statues, which owe their origin to Giotto, and form an important element in sepulchral monuments of this period, are very beautiful in design and workmanship. Hope raises her eyes to heaven and reaches out her hand to grasp a nosegay of budding flowers, while Temperance, with a wreath of ivy bound over her quiet brows, is a perfect image of the moderation which the Apostle enjoins as the sum of all virtues.

Another costly Lombard shrine was the Arca constructed to hold the remains of the great Saint and Father of the Latin Church, Augustine, whose bones had been deposited at Pavia in 700 A.D. by the Lombard king Liutprand. This imposing structure, with its four tiers and eight gables, decorated with crockets and finials and two hundred and ninety statues

Digitized by Google

of Apostles, Saints and Virtues, is more like a small Gothic temple than a tomb. The general design is excellent and the effect of the second story, where six angels are seen through open arches holding the winding-sheet on which the effigy of the Saint reposes, strikes us as remarkably good. The sculptors of this shrine, which cost four thousand florins, and was twelve years in course of erection, are generally supposed to have been Matteo and Bonino di Campione, two members of a family which gave Lombardy several generations of artists. To them we owe the best of the Scaligeri monuments at Verona, which, although wanting the simplicity of design and exquisite finish of Tuscan work, are splendid, and in many respects unique specimens of sepulchral art. They are the first instances of tombs being erected without the walls of a church, as if the lords of Verona had reared these proud memorials of their sovereign power before the eyes of all the people, in exultant witness of the iron rule which had trampled on their liberties and made Lombardy tremble.

That of Can Grande, the patron of Dante and the best of his race, originally formed the portal of S. Maria Antica, the chapel of his family, and deserves the praise bestowed upon it by Mr. Ruskin, who calls it the consummate form of Gothic tomb. The Gran Lombardo, with his sword by his side and a simple bonnet on his head, lies under an arched canopy crowned by an equestrian statue of himself in full armour, with floating drapery, 'so truly drawn by the old workman that it seems to wave in the wind, and the knight's spear to shake and his marble horse to be evermore quickening its pace as the silver clouds float past behind it in the sky.'[1] On the sarcophagus the chief events of Can Grande's history are represented in very slight relief, and serve as background for the statuettes of the Virgin and Angel of the Annunciation and central figure of Christ rising from the dead. The personality of the dead hero is brought before us, nothing of his great deeds is allowed to perish, but their remembrance is kept in its place, and does not obscure the hope of heaven which the angel had promised, and the rising of Christ had assured to man.

The tombs of the other Della Scala princes seem to be adorned with Saints and Virtues in proportion as their characters were stained with crime. Mastino, a vicious and unscrupulous tyrant, who boasted that twenty-three dethroned princes lived at his Court, has a pyramidal canopy above his effigy,

[1] *Stones of Venice*, vol. iii.

Digitized by Google

and is represented kneeling before Christ; while the fratricide, Can Signorio, sleeps attended by Virtues and guarded by all the soldier-saints. This highly-decorated monument, which Can Signorio caused Bonino di Campione to erect during his own lifetime, presents a curious union of Gothic and classical motives. Columns with Corinthian capitals support the Gothic niches where S. Louis and his comrade stand, and one angel with half-spread wings watches over the knight's sleeping effigy. The strong Venetian element perceptible in these tombs is also apparent in the Paduan monuments, of which one example, the tomb of Petrarch's friend, Jacopo di Carrara, is given in the Arundel photographs. Here we have the hood-like gables and deeply foliated cornices common in Venetian sculpture; the curtain is expanded into a huge canopy, and the angels are absent: a want partially compensated by the half-length cherubs placed at each corner with clasped hands. On another Paduan tomb, Federigo di Lavalengo, a Brescian Condottiere, who fought in the service of the ill-fated Francesco di Carrara, is six times represented in the costumes of the different offices which he held at various periods of his life.

The tombs of Venice are already well known to the student, owing to Mr. Ruskin's researches. No city boasts more numerous or more splendid sepulchres; and almost every type of monument may be studied in the churches of the Frari and of SS. Giovanni e Paolo. Here the recumbent figure does not appear till the fourteenth century, when it has the usual arched canopy. The sarcophagus is richly carved, and almost always bears in the centre figures of the Virgin and Angel of the Annunciation.

> 'L'angel che venne in terra col decreto
> Della molt' anni lagrimata pace,
> Ch'aperse il ciel dal suo lungo divieto.' [1]

Sometimes angels holding censers stand by the mortuary couch; more often we have the curtain-drawing figures introduced by Tuscan sculptors, many of whom worked in Venice. Statuettes of Virtues also appear frequently, but both these and the bas-reliefs on the sarcophagi are decidedly inferior in composition and workmanship to those of Tuscan masters, while, from the first, greater importance is given to leaf cornices and florid canopies. The taste for mundane splendour which marked Venetian painting here shows itself in an exuberance of ornament which causes details to become

[1] Dante, *Purgatorio*, x. 35.

Digitized by Google

increasingly prominent, until the central thought is lost in a confused mass of vegetation. Yet no one can deny that Venice possesses some of the noblest specimens of sepulchral art. Few conceptions of death are more beautiful than that of the knight in the Frari church, turning his face towards the vision of the Child Christ in the arms of S. Joseph, which broke on his dying eyes, or the noble Condottiere, Jacopo Cavalli, taking his rest all armed for battle with a lion at his head and a hound at his feet, 'not for his crest,' says the historian, 'but because he was brave and faithful in all the relations of life.'

This last tomb, by Paolo delle Massegne, one of a well-known family of sculptors, is a good example of highly decorated Venetian work. The wrinkled foliage is introduced with admirable effect, and the rich ornamentation of the sarcophagus contrasts finely with the plain and massive armour that girds the strong man's limbs, leaving nothing exposed but the folded hands and sharply-chiselled features of the face deeply set in its close helmet.

Besides the sarcophagus form, tomb slabs were common in all parts of Italy, and many are the churches, both in Venice and Florence, whose floors are paved with effigies of scholars and soldiers unknown to us by name, but who in their day were counted to have deserved well of their country.

The tombs of the Acciajoli at the Certosa of Val d'Ema are fine specimens of this class. There, conspicuous by its intricate workmanship, is the slab which marks the grave of Lorenzo Acciajoli, the favourite son whose early death wrung so bitter a cry from the Grand Seneschal, and whose splendid funeral excited the wonder of Florence. All the father's grief and tenderness speaks in this effigy of his lost son. Every line of the beautiful countenance has been carefully preserved. The long hair falls in graceful waves over his shoulders, and the hands are clasped together in prayer. The head, slightly bent forward, rests upon an embroidered pillow, and the Anjou lilies, which the Grand Seneschal was privileged to bear in his arms, are mingled with the Acciajoli lions, worked with marvellous delicacy over mantle and armour. The whole is framed in by spiral columns, which we see repeated in the other tombs of the founder's family belonging to the latter half of the fourteenth century. They were probably the work of Orgagna's pupils, and are among the last examples of Gothic tombs in Florence.

With the dawn of the fifteenth century we enter on a new age, in which Gothic arch and column give way to classical

Digitized by Google

forms, and purely Christian motives become blended with subjects derived from the antique. One of the first to leave the old types and originate fresh conceptions was the Sienese sculptor, Jacopo della Quercia. A close imitation of nature, together with a rare softness and grace of manner, distinguish all his work. This it is which charms us in his Virgin bending over the upturned face of her sleeping Child, now at South Kensington; this, blended with a deeper feeling, produced that masterpiece of sepulchral art, the tomb of Ilaria del Carretto at Lucca.

It was Della Quercia's fate to be all his life tormented by the jealousy and impatience of his fellow-citizens. 'God knows,' he exclaimed, at the close of his life, 'how many complaints and murmurs I have had to bear from my countrymen!' On one occasion he excited their wrath by the frequent visits he paid to Lucca while employed in the construction of Fonte Gaja at Siena. The object of these visits was this very tomb which Paolo Guinigi, lord of Lucca, had commissioned him to erect in memory of his beloved wife, Ilaria. Hardly was it completed than Paolo was driven out by the Lucchese, who pillaged his palace and broke up the tomb; but, whether out of love for Ilaria's memory, or reverence for so fair a thing, they forbore to destroy the effigy, which remained in its place against the Duomo wall, with a portion of the ornament which originally surrounded its base. In simple grace and tenderness of feeling this tomb has never been surpassed. Ilaria lies on her couch with closed eyes, and the pure outline of her face clearly seen. Her robe, fastened tight at the throat, falls in thick folds over her feet, which rest on a dog, 'because,' says Vasari, 'of the faith which she kept to her husband,' and round the base of the sarcophagus a band of winged children weave garlands of oak leaves, rose, and pomegranate, emblems of the graces and virtues which death had cropped too soon. Standing where it does, in the midway of the Renaissance, between the revival of art and the final spread of neo-paganism that worked its fall, Ilaria's tomb may be taken as a perfect example of the union of classic grace with Christian feeling, and, as the type of a fair and gracious womanhood, is one of those great works that belong, not to Lucca or Italy alone, but to the whole world.

Contemporary with Jacopo della Quercia were Ghiberti and Donatello, with both of whom he competed for the Baptistery gates. Ghiberti only executed one tomb slab, that of Lionardo Dati in S. Maria Novella; but Donatello left the stamp of his powerful imagination on the sepulchral

Digitized by Google

monument, as on every other branch of sculpture. Fired by that love of classic art which he and Brunelleschi had studied in the ruins of ancient Rome, he introduced radical changes in Arnolfo's old type of monument. Greek forms of architecture were substituted for the pointed arch and spiral column, the curtain was looped and twisted in heavy folds, and the angels were generally omitted. The sarcophagus, shaped into an urn or vase and concealed by elaborate ornamentation, was raised on a substructure decorated with festoons, cornucopiæ and arabesques, and enclosed in a niche, flanked by Renaissance pilasters. Winged genii holding coats of arms or wreaths of flowers, caryatides supporting the sarcophagus, or flaming vases as emblems of immortality, show the increasing predominance of Pagan motives. But Donatello's age, although it witnessed the revival of learning, had not lost faith in the unseen, and Christian hopes were still present to the artist's mind. In the upper part of the monument, on the surface left exposed within the recess of the arch, Donatello introduced a medallion of the Virgin and Child, surrounded by adoring angels, carved in the exquisite low relief in which he excelled, scarcely raised above the flat marble, and yet affording endless gradations of light and shade. This roundel of the Madonna, which took the place of Arnolfo's Gothic statuettes, became the distinguishing feature of Florentine fifteenth-century tombs, on which the sculptor bestowed infinite care and tenderness, and which were to suggest the form of Luca della Robbia's delicate blue and white medallions, and of Botticelli's most inspired creations.

Two large monuments which Donatello executed, with the assistance of Cosimo dei Medici's favourite architect, Michelozzo, may still be seen at Florence and Naples. One is that of Pope John XXIII., whose bronze countenance, modelled in gilt, is as strikingly individual as his notorious career would lead us to expect; the other records the name of his partisan, Cardinal Brancacci. A third, which must have been the finest of all, to judge from the broken-up fragments which still remain, was erected by order of the Papal secretary, Bartolommeo Aragazzi, for himself, in his native town of Montepulciano. While travelling between Arezzo and Montepulciano, the accomplished Greek scholar, Lionardo Bruni, met the Aragazzi monument stuck fast in the mud, from which struggling oxen strove in vain to extricate it. The driver, in despair of ever moving the heavy load, called loudly for curses on the head of poets, whose vanity, he declared, was the cause

Digitized by Google

of all this trouble. Bruni, who tells the story, remarks that no one who trusted in his own fame ever thought of raising a monument to himself, and exclaims, 'What can be more ignoble than to memoralize by a monument one whose life says nothing!' Aragazzi's hopes of perpetuating his memory by means of this monument were doomed to failure, for, when the church which contained it was pulled down, the tomb was destroyed, and nothing but fragments of the admirable bas-reliefs and statues which once belonged to it are now to be seen at Montepulciano.

To the vanity of Papal secretaries and scholars of the Medicean age we owe many of the finest tombs in Tuscany, amongst others that of Leonardo Bruni himself which Bernardo Rossellino erected in Santa Croce. All of these were the work of men formed on Donatello's style, and many of them his own pupils. Foremost among them was Desiderio di Settignano, 'il bravo Desider si dolce e si bello,' whose tomb of Carlo Marsuppini, another illustrious scholar and Papal secretary, is a marvel of delicate sculpture and skilfully-wrought ornament. An early death ended Desiderio's career. 'Nature, indignant at being outdone by him, cut short his days, but her vengeance proved vain, for he had given immortality to living marbles, and they to him.' His intimate friend, Mino da Fiesole, had a longer life and left many more works behind him. Everything which this artist, justly called the Raphael of sculpture, carved, is marked by the same refinement, the same exquisite sweetness and tenderness. From every tomb and altar that he sculptured, his Madonnas meet us for ever young and fair, and haunt us with their perpetual smile, almost monotonous from its very sweetness. Yet that there was strength as well as tenderness in his genius he has shown us in the bust of the good Bishop Salutati at Fiesole, one of the most striking heads ever fashioned in marble. The whole tomb, especially the figure of the beggar asking alms at the Bishop's feet, is most impressive, finer, perhaps, than either of those from the Badia which the Arundel series gives. Both, however, are in Mino's best manner, and the figure of Charity, on Count Ugo's tomb, bearing two children, is very graceful and winning. The later years of Mino's life were spent at Rome, in which city he executed many important works, and left lasting traces of his influence. To him Burckhardt ascribes, with great probability, the tomb-slab of Roderigo Sanctio, originally in the ruined church of the Spaniards, and now in the hall behind S. Maria di Monserrato, which Mr. Thompson gives as an anonymous work.

Digitized by Google

Another scholar of Donatello, who had much of Mino's grace with sometimes deeper feeling, was Antonio Rossellino, whose noble tomb of Cardinal James, of Portugal, occupies a chapel in the basilica of San Miniato. This young Cardinal, who died at the age of twenty-six, belonged to the Royal house of Portugal, and was as much celebrated for his learning and holiness as for the charm of his manner and the beauty of his person. 'Keeping in everything the middle way which is the way of the blessed,' writes his biographer,[1] 'he lived in the flesh the life of an angel rather than that of a man, and his death was holy as his life had been.' So rare a character deserved a fitting memorial, and the sculptor has given us a faithful portrait of the young Cardinal with the calm beatitude of death resting upon his face. All around we have the usual mourning genii and heavy draperies, the same gracious Madonna blessing the silence of the grave with her heavenly smile, while on either side two kneeling angels, bearing crown and palm in their hands, bend over the sleeping form, and seem to wait the moment of his awaking. These guardian angels are repeated in the tomb of Mary of Aragon, which the same sculptor executed at Naples, and which he adorned with a bas-relief of the resurrection, remarkable for the same feeling and admirable finish.

Two other monuments whose special characteristics invite attention are Benedetto da Maiano's of Filippo Strozzi, with the graceful angels hovering on either side, and that of Benozzo Federighi, Bishop of Fiesole, in the church at the foot of Bello Sguardo Hill, which Luca della Robbia wreathed with garlands of flowers and fruit painted on enamelled tiles of his own invention.

But, perhaps, of all Tuscan sculptors, the one who combined deep religious earnestness with the most varied powers was Matteo Civitali of Lucca, whose monument to Pietro di Noceto in the Duomo of his native city occupies the foremost rank both in excellence of conception and workmanship. In general design this tomb is similar to those of Mino and Rossellino. The decoration is very elaborate, and genii bearing candelabra are introduced among the festoons and cornucopiæ on the base, while, in the upper part, two fine profile heads of Pietro's son and daughter-in-law, admirably carved in low-relief, form a novel feature. It is curious to notice the death's head and cross-bones which appear among the elegant and profuse decoration of this and other contemporary monu-

[1] Vespasiano.

Digitized by Google

ments, as if the revival of Pagan art and learning had brought with it a vivid sense of the gloom and horror of death unknown to an earlier generation. Before long, these funeral emblems became common subjects with the sculptors of the day, one of whom, Benedetto da Rovezzano, adorned a tomb entirely with skulls, cross-bones, and harpies, arranged in elegant and symmetrical patterns.

By the close of the fifteenth century the Christian sentiment, which had originally been so powerful an agent in artistic conception, was already on the wane; and except in Florence, where a certain earnestness of purpose and seriousness of thought still retained its hold over the sculptor's mind, we find motives of a very mixed character introduced in sepulchral monuments. At Rimini, Sigismund Malatesta reared a temple to his mistress, Isotta, adorned with every variety of Pagan emblem, and placed her remains in a sarcophagus resting on elephants; and at Bergamo, Bartolommeo Colleoni raised an equestrian statue over his tomb with Mars and Hercules on either side. In a corner of the same chapel is a far more interesting monument which marks the resting place of Medea Colleoni, the child of the great Condottiere's old age. The dead girl is laid there in her flowing robes of brocade, with the short locks curling over delicately-shaped head and slender ear, and a pearl necklace clasped round her long throat, sleeping quietly while virgin-saints keep watch around her. In that happy, youthful slumber she has lost none of the charm and individuality of life, and becomes for us the type of maidenly purity and loveliness, as Ilaria at Lucca represents the ideal wife. The sculptor of this tomb, Amadeo, belonged to the school of artists which had sprung up round Gian Galeazzo's convent of the Certosa, an important centre of Lombard art, and containing within its own walls many fine monuments. Amongst others are the tombs of Lodovico Sforza and his young wife, Beatrix, of Este, whom, with all his crimes, he loved so fondly, and by whose grave he watched the night before his last flight from Milan. Both are interesting for the vivid individuality of the heads, and accurate rendering of every detail of costume. The robe of the duchess is a network of rich embroidery, her long eyelashes are deeply carved in the marble, and the crisp ringlets of luxuriant hair, escaping from under her tight-fitting hood, fall on brow and neck, while pillow and shroud alike are patterned over with the delicate ornament in which Lombard sculptors delighted to show the dexterity of their chisel.

We can only mention one other Lombard monument, the

Digitized by Google

tomb of Gaston de Foix, which Francis I. commissioned Agostino Busti to execute, but which, after the defeat of Pavia, eight years afterwards, remained incomplete. Ultimately it was broken up and the separate fragments scattered into all countries. Fortunately, the effigy, one of the finest monumental statues in existence, was preserved, and is now in the Brera at Milan. The death of this boy-hero in the moment of victory and in the full tide of his career of conquest was of itself a theme to inspire the dullest fancy. Busti felt this, and represented him as he died clasping his sword to his breast, with a laurel wreath on his brow, and proud gladness on his face for joy because of the shouts of triumph which rang in his dying ear. The armour is perfectly plain, without ornament of any kind, and the sculptor seems to have caught the haughty expression of the young soldier, who walked the streets of Milan, stern and silent, followed only by a single page. The design of the whole tomb, a mortuary couch surrounded by candelabra and enriched with statues, trophies of arms and other reliefs, may be seen in a drawing ascribed to Lionardo da Vinci now in the South Kensington Museum. In the same collection some of the high-reliefs belonging to the original monument are preserved, and are exquisite specimens of deeply-cut marble work. Among the best of these are a youth leading a prancing horse, a warrior crowned by Apollo on a triumphal car, and a statuette of Fortitude, with a smile on her parted lips as she rejoices over her hero.

Busti's other works are by no means equal to this one either in design or execution; but his tomb of the poet Lancinus Curtius is a striking instance of the neo-Paganism that was fast superseding Christian imagery. There is no allusion to the protection of Saints and Angels, or the hope of a future life. The scholar sleeps between Cupids holding reversed torches and winged horses, emblematic of poetic inspiration, and it scarcely needs the Latin epitaph to tell us that his hopes are all of earthly fame:

> 'En virtutem mortis nesciam!
> Vivet Lancinus Curtius
> Sæcula per omnia,
> Quascumque lustrans oras,
> Tantum possunt Camenæ.'

None the less, Lancinus Curtius is unknown to us, and all the Muses could not save his poems from oblivion.

When we enter on the sixteenth century the decline of sepulchral art becomes clearly visible, and neither skilful

Digitized by Google

workmanship nor elegant decoration can supply the absence of thought. In their anxiety to invent original motives, the sculptors of this age placed the statues of the dead in new postures, neither imitating the activity of life nor the repose of death, but endeavouring to effect a sort of compromise between the two, as in Sansovino's monuments of the Cardinals Ascanio Sforza and Girolamo dello Rovere, who are represented raising themselves on their elbows, a prey to troubled dreams and uneasy slumber. Was it that these men shrank from the sight of death in all its silence and rigidity, or did a guilty conscience picture it to their eyes in this unhappy form?

From these effigies of worldly Roman Cardinals we turn with positive relief to another tomb in the same church of S. Maria del Popolo. It is that of a young knight, Marco Albertoni, who died of the plague in 1485, and, without being distinguished by any especial beauty, is a perfect image of the repose which seems unknown to sixteenth-century sculptors. The youthful form, with quietly-folded hands, on whose face no trace of trouble or regret appears, is a far lovelier figure of death, and appeals with much greater power to our sympathies than all the elaborate emptiness of Sansovino's invention.

Wherever we turn we find the same futile endeavour to hide feebleness of conception by a lavish use of ornament, and the size and costliness of the material employed. At Venice, where we have before noticed the tendency to worldly pomp, every symbol of adulation is used to enhance the ostentatious splendour of Doges' tombs. Victories, fames, sea-monsters as emblems of maritime supremacy, adorn the frieze and occupy niches between the pillars, while in one tomb, in the Frari, colossal negroes, in full Venetian costume, bear the sarcophagus on their shoulders. The epitaph of one of these worthies, Bishop Jacopo Pesaro, is amusing from the evident attempt to combine the essence of worldliness with expressions suitable to the office the deceased had held in the Church:—

'Jacopo Pesaro, transported from a noble Venetian family to a nobler among the angels, expects the noblest crown which the just Judge shall give him in the last sentence. He lived the years of Plato.'

Not only at Venice, but elsewhere, we find the most incongruous elements side by side, as in a tomb by the Milanese sculptor Riccio, where S. Paul is represented preaching to an audience, among which we see Apollo and various heathen demi-gods, and Charon ferrying souls across the Styx appears side by side with a Christian burial procession.

Digitized by Google

The last remnants of purer taste lingered on in Florence, where here and there a tomb retains the characteristic of an earlier age. Such is the sepulchral slab which marks the last resting-place of Lionardo Buonafede, Bishop of Cortona, and during many years Prior of the great Florentine hospital, S. Maria Nuova. No adulatory inscription was needed to record the virtues of a prelate whose good works were renowned in Florence, nor has the sculptor sought to display his skill by excessive decoration. All we have is the simple peace-breathing effigy of the good Bishop, whose ninety years' life had been one long act of love, and to whom death had brought his soul's desire.

Another excellent sculptor of tombs was Benedetto da Rovezzano, whose works met with singular misfortune. His great shrine of S. Giovanni Gualberto at Vallombrosa was, soon after its completion, broken to pieces by Papal and Imperial soldiers during the siege of Florence, and the tomb which he executed in England for Cardinal Wolsey underwent a whole history of strange vicissitudes. On the disgrace of the Cardinal it was seized by Henry VIII., for whose sepulchre, however, it was not used; and after the execution of Charles I., who had intended it for his own burial, it was shorn of its decorations by order of Parliament, and finally used to hold the remains of Nelson.

The last development of Florentine sepulchral statuary was reserved for Michael Angelo, who showed in this branch of art, as in many others, how it is possible for genius to rise above the conditions of its age. We know that the mausoleum of Pope Julius II., which cost him years of labour and bitterness of soul, was never executed. It was to have been of colossal dimensions: all the liberal arts were to have stood round the open tomb of the pontiff whom the Romans celebrated as a second Mars, with Earth weeping the loss, Heaven rejoicing in the gain of his soul. That it would have been a stupendous work we can well believe, but it is a loss we are scarcely inclined to deplore. For us the tombs of the Medici embody Michael Angelo's profoundest thought. Here, at least, is no empty decoration, no frigid conceit of pseudo-Hellenic fancy. In actual knowledge he went far beyond most of his brother artists, but all the learning of the Renaissance could not hide God from his eyes. The serene beauty of repose in which sculptors of a former generation had delighted was not for him. It is the weariness of life, the heaviness of a burden which he could never lay down, that stirs us with strange power in these rough-hewn shapes of Morning and Evening, of Day

Digitized by Google

and Night, above which the shadowy Duke sits rapt in lonely musings. They tell the tragedy, not only of Florence, but of the human heart; not only the night which had sunk upon her, and the pain it cost him to see her captive, but the gloom which closes round the spirit in the long hours of the struggle with doubt and wrong.

And they mark, too, the end of an epoch the like of which the world was never to see again. For, after Michael Angelo, decline became rapid. His very greatness proved baneful to his followers. Inferior artists strove to imitate him by adopting colossal figures and forced attitudes, without the redeeming power of thought which had made the cold marble speak with such passionate emotion. Thus unity of design was sacrificed, and even technical perfection lost. Baccio Bandinelli's heavy and ill-proportioned tombs of Roman pontiffs, and Ammanati's colossal monument to the vainglorious jurist, Benavides of Padua, are but examples of the vicious taste which prevailed in the latter part of the sixteenth century. We feel as we look at these tasteless conceptions how far removed they are from the days when knight and bishop slept guarded by angel-hands and bright visions of Madonna and Saints smiled down upon their slumbers. The hope which could conquer death and bring down heavenly presences to cheer the darkness of the grave, the strong faith which had filled Italy with masterpieces of the sculptor's art, had ceased to be a living power with the men of this generation. This world was all they had to live for, since the other had faded from their sight, and death could be nothing but a fearful and horrible thing, a yawning abyss, at the mouth of which stood the skeleton with bony hands, beckoning men to enter. Conscious only of the gloom and horror of the tomb, they sought in vain to conceal it by outward pomp and grandeur, or the idle repetition of pagan fables which had long since lost all their freshness. Henceforth, the sepulchral monument, deprived of beauty and meaning, was little better than a charnel-house, whose imposing structure or splendour of material contrasted painfully with its uses, and in which nothing could atone for the decay of the vital principle which had first called it into being.

Digitized by Google

ART. IV.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

1. *The Life and Work of S. Paul.* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. 2 vols. (London, Paris, and New York, 1879.)
2. *Introduction to the Epistle of Paul, the Apostle to the Hebrews.* By W. F. MOULTON, D.D. (A New Testament Commentary for English Readers, by Various Writers, edited by Charles John Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.) Vol. III. (London, Paris, and New York, 1879.)
3. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* By FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D. Translated by Thomas L. Kingsbury, M.A. 2 vols. (Edinburgh, London, and Dublin, 1868 and 1874.)
4. *Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews.* (The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the original Greek; with Notes and Introductions by CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln.) Vol. II. (London, Oxford, and Cambridge, 1872.)
5. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* (*Prolegomena* to the Greek Testament, by HENRY ALFORD, D.D., late Dean of Canterbury.) Vol. IV. (London, Oxford, and Cambridge, 1880.)
6. *An Introduction to the New Testament.* By FRIEDRICH BLEEK, Professor of Theology, University of Bonn, Translated from the second German edition by the Rev. W. URWICK. M.A. 2 vols. (Edinburgh and London, 1874.)
7. *An Introduction to the New Testament:* Epistle to the Hebrews. Vol. III. By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D. (London.)
8. *On the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Horne's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures.* Vol. IV. Edited by the late SAMUEL PRIDEAUX TREGELLES, LL.D.
9. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* Article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.* Vol. I. By the late Rev. W. T. BULLOCK, M.A. (London, 1863.)

WE are led by some recent utterances, in no way conspicuous for their lack of self-confidence, to review the questions concerning the great Epistle to the Hebrews. But it were well

Digitized by Google

to remember *in limine* that no doubts respecting its authorship, or the place to which it was addressed, affect its allowed inspiration. Many books have been received by the Church, and cherished in her canon, whilst little or nothing has been known of the writers or first readers; and if few of the Holy Scriptures have endured a sharper debate, by theologians ancient and modern, with regard to author and origin, than this Epistle, fewer still have received from all sides such a consensus of admiration and, indeed, vindication of canonicity. Whose hands they were which actually penned its glowing words will never certainly be known on earth. As Origen said of old, *θεὸς οἶδεν*. But at least we may be sure who was the Apostle to the Hebrews—*κατανοήσατε τὸν Ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν* ΙΗΣΟΥΝ. His, of a truth, is the Epistle to His people; the breath of the Holy Spirit lingers on its matchless pages, and the marks on the sacred roll are those of the Finger of God.

So far as possible we would divest our minds of *præjudicium* for or against any writer, putting aside *pendente lite* even the authoritative declarations of the Church itself. And perhaps, if we first examine the lesser controversy as to what persons they were to whom the Letter was written, a greater point of the inquiry will be furthered; for we shall see more clearly who did not write it, though we may not positively assert who did.

Observation is drawn at once to its abrupt beginning. Unlike other books of the New Testament, this has no address whatever, nor any initial sign of authorship. All the remaining Epistles, except 1 S. John, open with plain statements concerning those by whom and for whom they were put forth; S. Luke, moreover, begins his Gospel with such a preface, and similarly the Acts of the Apostles. But the writer to the Hebrews plunges, like some visored knight, into the fray; who, if he be known, can only be so by the mighty strokes which mark his onset. Not that his work is a mere polemic, or treatise, or even exquisite *argumentum ad rem;* frequent personal appeals, in language fervent—almost passionate—deliver it from such a charge. Neither is it a circular letter addressed to the whole Christian Church; nor, indeed, to the Hebrew Christians dispersed abroad. Special references seem rather to be made to the converted Jews of some large rich city: '*Ye* are dull of hearing' (v. 11); 'When for the time *ye* ought to be teachers, *ye* have need that one teach *you* again,' &c. (v. 12); 'We are persuaded better things of *you*' (vi. 9); 'God is not unrighteous to forget *your* work, and

Digitized by Google

labour of love, which *ye* have showed toward His Name, in that *ye* have ministered to the saints, and do minister' (vi. 10); 'And we desire that *every one of you* do show the same diligence (vi. 11) that *ye* be not slothful' (vi. 12). Again (x. 32–34), 'Call to remembrance the former days in which after *ye* were illuminated *ye* endured a great fight of afflictions; partly whilst *ye* were made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly whilst *ye became companions* of them that were so used,' &c.; '*Ye* have not yet resisted unto blood' (xii. 4). Compare also xiii. 7, 19, 23.

Who then, we ask, were these persons so well known in the trials of their faith, both in failure and success, to the writer of this Epistle; and apparently for a course of years? Where was their home—Palestine, Italy, Africa; for surely it was in one country of the three? If the latter view be entertained, Alexandria alone can be the city; and at once we find reason for the Septuagint quotations; for it will hardly be denied that the original of the whole letter is Greek.[1] The Hebrews of Alexandria were rich and cultured; profoundly versed, we may add, in Gentile as well as Jewish philosophy. The reference in chap. xii. 1. to the public games would be apt enough; and the famous Canon of Muratori mentions an 'Epistola ad Alexandrinos.' But, on the other hand, there is really no positive evidence that our Epistle is the one so designated; nor, in short, for the theory at all: and the absence of such testimony cannot help being contrasted with the presence of tradition in favour of claims elsewhere.[2] Nor can the LXX argument be pressed; for, in fact, many of the passages quoted are independent translations from the Hebrew text; being such as might be made by any learned Jew for those of his brethren who were conversant mostly with Greek.

Several, indeed, of the above pleas for Egypt might be urged with greater force and candour on behalf of Italy, and pre-eminently its empress city. Nowhere could the allusion to the games be so happy; and the history of the Church at Rome warrants much of the support which this destination has received from Alford and his scholars. 'The great fight of afflictions' referred to in chap. x. 32, and the being made

[1] That the language preserved to us is the author's own may safely be concluded, in spite of the belief—ancient, as Clemens Alex.; and modern, as Hallet—that we have only a Greek translation of the Hebrew (or rather Aramaic) original. Comp. Horne, iv. 569–571; Wordsworth iv. 374; Davidson iii. 235 and 277–286; Alford iv. 76–79. Delitzsch 'is certain that it is not a translation,' cf. vol ii. 410.

[2] Cf. Alford iv. 67.

Digitized by Google

'a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions,' beheld exposed in the arena—*θεατριζόμενοι*, pointing clearly, in their opinion, Romewards. But, if these were the Neronian persecutions, scarcely could it be said to the Christian community which underwent them, 'Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin' (xii. 4). And again *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας*, who salute the persons addressed in the letter, make as much against the Roman contention as for it.

If, however, the Palestinian theory be held, either Cæsarea or Jerusalem must be the place intended: and the former is as unlikely as the latter assuredly is the contrary; while, furthermore, a large majority of opinion pronounces for her. The commentators who maintain a strictly Pauline view of the Epistle seem, perforce thereof, to address it to Jerusalem; and, besides, there are considerable arguments from local allusions to the Temple worship in chap. ix. Nevertheless, these, in fairness we admit, would be understood by all Passover pilgrims: in other words, by most Jews of every place. And further, the exceeding difficulty of identifying local dangers and persecutions with any consistent scheme of dates in the records of the Holy City renders conclusion uncertain after all. Perhaps the weightiest inference for settlement of this part of the controversy is from chap. xiii. 12–14. The 'burning without the camp,' *i.e.* in the valley of Jehoshaphat, of those beasts whose blood was brought into the Holy of Holies; the parallel suffering of our Saviour 'without the gate,' and the appeal to 'go forth therefore unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach;' all these point apparently to the withdrawal or expulsion of His followers from Jerusalem. 'Here' was 'no continuing city;' but the Christian outcast, far happier than the homeless Jew, had prepared for him 'one to come.' And—

'Truly Jerusalem name we that shore'—

whatever doubts may linger as to the designation of the earthly tabernacles, left behind.

But we hasten to consider the main disputation,—By whom was the Epistle written? We find it accredited to the great Apostle of the Gentiles by some of the very foremost ecclesiastical writers; and, in the same times, a contrary opinion maintained by others. 'The Alexandrine fathers,' says Westcott,[1] 'uniformly recognized it as possessed of Apostolic authority, if not, indeed, as the work of S. Paul. The early Latin fathers, with equal unanimity, either excluded

[1] *Canon of the New Testament*, p. 367.

Digitized by Google

it from the canon or ignored its existence.' Tertullian attributed it to S. Barnabas; Cyprian implicitly denied it to S. Paul by mentioning seven of his letters only; Victorinus and Jerome similarly; and no Latin father, before Hilary of Poictiers, quotes it otherwise. Mediæval authorities are lacking also. Isidore of Seville, early in the seventh century, seems to have doubted it, chiefly because of a difference in style from other parts of the New Testament. 'But this doubt was rather felt than declared; and its existence is shown by the absence of quotations from the Epistle rather than by open attacks on its authority.'[1] Most of the Reformation divines—including Calvin, Erasmus, Luther, and Melanchthon—were opposed to the Pauline theory; Beza thought with them at first, but afterwards changed his opinion. Naturally enough, Rome protects her own conclusion by anathema; although what was certain in 1546 to the Council of Trent appears to have been doubtful to the Infallible Chair in the third and fourth centuries. It is wiser and safer, perhaps, on the whole, to hold our minds in suspense as to the actual authorship of the Epistle, with Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine; while asserting with them its Pauline character: for, if they were unable to settle such conflicting claims, we can hardly hope for success. Left to ourselves and to the difficulty of internal evidence, we may only with moderate certainty conclude that the Great Unknown was a Jew, a contemporary of the Apostles, a friend of Timothy (chap. xiii. 23), a teacher of the Church (xiii. 19) to which his letter was indited, whilst himself absent from it altogether or awhile. The remainder is a *quæstio vexata:* but, willing or unwilling, divines are driven now-a-days to reopen it, and examine for themselves, as best they can, the comments of new writers, more or less able and zealous.

The Epistle has been ascribed to Paul, Apollos, Barnabas, Luke, Titus, Silas, Aquila, Clemens Romanus, and to some one altogether nameless and unknown. Thus, principally, as regards single and separate origin; but, further, a double authorship has been asserted on behalf of Paul and Luke, and again of Paul and Clemens Romanus. Davidson advocates the edition of S. Paul's language and ideas at the hand of his friend, 'the beloved physician,' S. Luke. Amanuensis the evangelist most probably was to the infirm Apostle, after the days of Tertius, who wrote the Roman letter; but, the able argument for his actual composition of this Epistle

[1] *Canon of the New Testament*, p. 447.

Digitized by Google

to the Hebrews might be extended further than the work of mere editorship: in fact, to an agreement with some of the German commentators in favour of S. Luke's sole authorship, which the Hebraist Delitzsch concedes to have been possible, while himself contending only that 'Luke composed the Epistle from statements made to him by the Apostle, being commissioned by the latter thereto.'[1] Alford and Wordsworth, on the other hand, oppose the joint edition theory; and, to pass over other reasons, the former well remarks that 'the [*i.e.* personal] notices, which on the hypothesis of pure Pauline authorship seemed difficult of explanation, appear absolutely to defy it if the secondary authorship be supposed.'[2]

A less minute inquiry is demanded on the part of the Roman Clement, or as to Aquila, Silvanus, or Titus. There are few intelligible reasons for them, and those mostly negative; while unlikelihood from divers causes, and the absence of tradition, may be urged against them all. Aquila and Silas were Jews; but in other respects their pretensions deserve least consideration.

Three names of the list are left; those of Barnabas, Apollos, Paul: besides which there is the contention for a writer wholly anonymous and undiscoverable. The last idea, observe we merely in passing, has but feeble friends, and can be at once dismissed: for the namelessness, so called, must have been very eloquent, the obscurity most transparent, the index of the writer assuredly plain, in the minds of those men to whom were addressed the closing words of the Epistle, and specially, xiii. 19, 'I beseech you the rather to do this [pray, *i.e.*], that I may be restored to you the sooner.'

For S. Barnabas, a Levite, 'a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith,' one dignified, moreover, by the title of Apostle, there are contended the Levitical bearing of the Epistle, its thoughts and words, and whole ground of appeal to the Jews But the excellent worth of S. Barnabas is hardly a convincing proof in a question of this kind. And, would a Levite have penned the account of the Holy of Holies preserved for us in chapter ix. 4? It is true that Barnabas was a Cypriot by birth, and therefore connected with Alexandria rather than Jerusalem; though Alford allows not so much as that. On the other hand, there is no tradition of him as the writer, although one exists in connexion with the Egyptian capital. His name, we are reminded, equals 'The

[1] Vol. ii. 416. [2] Vol. iv. p. 50, § 150.

Digitized by Google

Son of Exhortation;' but surely, if 'The Epistle of Barnabas' be a specimen of his hortatory powers, this appeal to the Hebrews cannot be from the same mouth. To wade through the trivialities, not to say indelicacies, of the former is quite sufficient to settle the controversy. The two efforts are absolutely diverse in each particular; and to assert that one was written under the influence of the Holy Spirit, while the other was not, is too dangerous a style of eclecticism to be seriously maintained. If the so-called Epistle of Barnabas be not genuine,[1] at least we may think its forger was at some pains to imitate the known method of the Saint: certainly he had not before him, as a model, the famous Epistle to the Hebrews. In fact, neither is there ecclesiastical tradition nor any real argument to be advanced for this candidature. Tertullian, however, of the ancients, and Wieseler, of the moderns, defend it as best they may; and Bullock's article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*[2] rather favours their singular views. But unanswerable objections are brought against them by Davidson.[3]

All that can be said on behalf of Apollos has been well pleaded for him by Dean Alford; and, confessedly, a fair case, on the first appearance, has been made out. Certain conditions as to authorship are required, or alleged to be so; and the known or accredited qualities alike of the Alexandrian Jew—declared, however, authoritatively, to have been 'an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures'—are made to answer these postulates. The writer of the letter is not allowed to have been an Apostle, nor even one of the first converts to Christianity; and in support of this exclusion we are referred to chapter ii. 3, 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, *and was confirmed unto us* by them that heard, God also bearing them witness?' &c.

Again: if the author were a Jew, which is tolerably certain, it is urged that he must have been Hellenistic, since he wrote as one unacquainted with the then existing Temple-worship (ch. ix.). Undeniably familiar with S. Paul's style and habits of thought, yet an Alexandrian current in the author's mind is held to be traceable throughout. The Septuagint is quoted for the most part; and, scattered up and down the Epistle are expressions coincident with those of Philo. And Apollos is presumed to satisfy all these requirements. Every word of

[1] Funk, in his new edition of the *Op. Pat. Apost.*, ascribes it to an Alexandrian writer of the first century.

[2] Vol. i. p. 774, note i.

[3] Vol. iii. p. 166–7.

Digitized by Google

Acts xviii. 24-28 is said 'to point him out as the person of whom we are in search'.[1] 'Just as it was not easy to imagine either S. Luke, or Clement, or Barnabas, to have written such an Epistle,' so now it is felt 'from all the characteristics given of Apollos in the sacred narrative, that if he wrote at all it would be an Epistle precisely of this kind both in contents and in style.'[2]

Here in sum are the pleas on his behalf: concerning which Delitzsch critically remarks, 'it must be confessed that any strong argument in favour of Apollos' authorship has not been produced.'[3]

The very first idea of it seems to have been vouchsafed to Luther; but with the not unprejudiced Reformer are the weighty names of Bleek, Tholuck, and De Wette, and many of lesser note. Dr. Moulton, the latest English commentator, following these in the wake of Alford, declares 'certainly all the conditions of the problem appear to be satisfied by this conjecture;' and has 'no hesitation in joining those who hold it,' while he nevertheless admits that his favoured hypothesis is one 'for which no express evidence can be adduced from ancient times.'[4]

For less obvious reasons still, and with widely different language,[5] Dr. Farrar upholds the modest conclusion of the venerable grammarian.

But, severally and collectively, these opinions have been traversed by theologians of greater number and weight; and the residuum of the theory is preserved in this, as in the other claims already discussed, by evidence indirect and not direct, and by negative testimony rather than positive. There is absolutely no external nor traditional argument whatever for Apollos; and the silence of fifteen centuries, in the Church whose promised guide was the Holy Ghost, must be by some means accounted for, or else explained away. Further, even the Alexandrine legends are Pauline, and these surely are sufficient counterpoise to the alleged traces of Alexandrian origin in the Letter. But, most worthy of note, the LXX quotations, on which frequent stress has been laid, are not always verbally exact: on the contrary, they literally correspond with some undisputed references by another hand than that of Apollos. In truth, much of the captious support bestowed on the modern theory might be given with equal justice to divers applicants for the niche of fame: nor is our

[1] Alford, vol. iv. pp. 58–61.
[2] *Ibid.* 59, clause 182.
[3] Vol. i. Introduction, p. 18.
[4] *New Testament Commentary*, vol. iii. p. 281.
[5] Vol. i. p. 10.

Digitized by Google

faith quickened when we are taught to see in the party-feeling at Corinth inveighed against in the opening chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians a sufficient reason for the anonymity of—Apollos! And there is an arrogance on the side of his fautors, an intellectual scorn and exuberance of contempt for all others, which are in no ways required by the matter. Forster's advocacy of S. Paul was complained of bitterly by Alford; but the tables have long since been reversed by his own disciples.

And now let us turn to the investigation of the no less weighty though more unfashionable claims. Of external evidence in favour of S. Paul as the writer to the Hebrews, we are first referred by his champions to the declaration of S. Peter (2 S. Pet. iii. 15–16). From this passage they tell us 'it is evident

'I. That Peter had read all Paul's letters.

'II. That Paul had written to those Christians to whom Peter was then writing: that is, to the believing Jews in general (cp. 2 Pet. i. 1), and to the dispersion mentioned in 1 Pet. i. 1. Now, since there is no evidence to prove that Epistle was lost, it follows that it must be that which is now inscribed "To the Hebrews."

'III. That Paul wrote to them concerning the same topics which were the subjects of Peter's Epistle.'[1]

But S. Peter's words must, we fear, be strained beyond their ordinary and natural sense to convey the assurance that he had read all the letters ever written by S. Paul; or even each one commonly called an 'epistle.' The exact words of S. Peter, *καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε*, are no reproduction of any sacred writing extant; so that *καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος . . . ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν* must not be taken literally; nor may any absolute conclusions be derived therefrom. Singularly enough, the nearest approach to this passage is not in the Hebrews, but in Romans ii. 4, *ἢ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς . . . μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς*, where the idea is practically the same. 'Account the long-suffering of our Lord salvation,' urges S. Peter; as S. Paul indignantly had asked, 'Despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance, and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?' And, in short, 'the same topics which were the subject of Peter's Epistle' must more or less be those of every Christian advocate. Not much dependence, therefore, can be placed on this supposed reference to the Hebrews,

[1] Horne, vol. iv., p. 573.

Digitized by Google

and the other like arguments brought forward by Horne. But when, for further outside testimony, we come to ecclesiastical tradition, we are at once impressed by the authorities who cite the Epistle as S. Paul's: notably Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Socrates, Theophylact. 'There is no reason to doubt that, at first, everywhere, except in North Africa, Paul was regarded as the author.' The Alexandrian fathers, with the critical acumen of their school, discovered the variation in style of this Epistle from the other works of S. Paul; the Latin doctors, whether of Africa or Europe, followed and went beyond this opinion. Hilary of Poictiers, Ambrose of Milan, however, with some others, are exceptions to the rule; and the doubts of Jerome and Augustine are accounted for by Hug in reference to the Montanists and Novatians, who based their doctrine on chap. vi. 4–6.

Internal evidence for or against S. Paul would seem to be hopelessly in conflict. To some theologians the plan [1] of the Epistle is conspicuously Pauline, the doctrine, even the phraseology: to others, *mirabile dictu!* all is the direct opposite —rhetoric, composition, manner of quotation. Horne urged the correspondence of its general method with that of the acknowledged letters of S. Paul; the overflowing of sentiment which distinguished him from every other sacred writer; the innumerable marks of his peculiar Scriptural and traditional learning; the doctrinal propositions as to the Gospel, the person and work of Christ—all in harmony with like statements in the other Epistles; and, lastly, coincidences of words and phrases.[2] But Tregelles, when re-editing this fourth volume of the Introduction, justly remarked that some of its arguments appeared 'to prove no point of the case.'[3] Again, Bishop Wordsworth's defence of the Pauline authorship, earnestly maintained in his accustomed manner,[4] was opposed by the colder views of Dean Alford,[5] who considered in detail

[1] Briefly, the purport of the whole Letter is an appeal to Jewish converts inclined to apostasy. And, if this be the first intention, there is the second and wider application to all: namely, the contrast of the Gospel dispensation with that of the old covenant, the superiority of Christ to the Levitical priesthood, and the exceeding greatness of His voluntary sacrifice: thus a protest to the Church for ever against any relapse into the bondage of the Law. But cp. Alford, 74–5; Wordsworth, 369, 375, 378; Davidson, 289–8; Horne, 585–6.

[2] Vol. iv. 577–583.

[3] p. 584.

[4] pp. 364–371, and 373.

[5] 42–47, and 50.

Digitized by Google

the principal notices in the Epistle which had been adduced for or against this theory. Dr. Davidson's review of all the evidence was complained of, from the same quarter, apparently because of his calm statements thereupon. But it would be difficult to arrange the matter more fairly or judicially, or to arrive at a juster conclusion than this of a writer in no way subservient to tradition; and the little, at most, which can be said on the part of Apollos and the rest looks slight enough in comparison with the arguments for Paul. If it were needful for Apollos to conceal his hand, *a fortiori* was it so for him who of all men was most obnoxious to the Jews. It is reasonable that he would not thrust an altered name, and Gentile recollections, on his sensitive fellow-countrymen; and, remembering his fervent love and zeal for Israel, even Israel 'after the flesh,' we need not cast about for other lips as the inditers of this matchless appeal. It would be quite of a piece with his noble and unselfish nature to include himself with his hearers in the passage from chap. ii. 3–4, whereon so much opposition to his authorship has been founded.[1] He could wish himself 'accursed from Christ' (Rom. ix. 3) for his brethren's sake; much more may he, in pleading with them here, have laid aside his apostleship and revelations, whereof he gloried aforetime to the Galatians.

But a strange witness on the side of the Pauline apologists is still to be heard; though it seems to have been omitted hitherto. And, for sake of it, we may be pardoned if we pass over more briefly some of the testimony less unfamiliar.

Of the Old Testament quotations in the Epistle we find the following only are literally taken from the LXX :—

Heb.	I.	5, (i.e. Υἱός μου, κ.τ.λ.) from Psalm ii. 7.
„		6, from Deut. xxxii. 43.
„		13, from Psalm cx. 1.
„	II.	6–8, from Psalm viii. 4–7. (But in a different order of words.)
„		13, from Isa. xii. 2, and viii. 18.
„	V.	5, from Psalm ii. 7.
„		6, from Psalm cx. 4.
„	VI.	14, from Gen. xxii. 17.
„	X.	30, (κρινεῖ Κύριος) from Deut. xxxii. 36.
„	XI.	18, from Gen. xxi. 12.
„	XIII.	6, from Psalm cxviii. 6, and lvi. 11.

While the remainder are more or less free translations from the Hebrew; thrown off, as it were, rapidly by some one skilled in that and the Greek version as well, viz.:—

[1] Not the least being the grammatical one of Delitzsch *in loco*, vol. i. p. 99. But cp. ii. 413.

Digitized by Google

For Heb. I. 5, (i.e. Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι, κ.τ.λ.) cp. 1 Chron. xxii. 10.
„ 7, cp. Psalm civ. 4.
„ 8–9, cp. Psalm xlv. 6–7.
„ 10–12, cp. Psalm cii. 25–27.
„ II. 12, cp. Psalm xxii. 22–25.
„ III. 7–11, cp. Psalm xcv. 8–11. (But obs. the variations of the best codices from the Received Text.)
„ 15, ibid. (Again Heb. iv. 7.)
„ IV. 3, ibid.
„ 4, cp. Gen. ii. 2.
„ VIII. 5, cp. Ex. xxv. 40.
Ex. xxvi. 30.
Ex. xxvii. 8.
„ 8–12, Jer. xxxi. 31–34.
„ IX. 20, Ex. xxiv. 5–8.
„ X. 5–7, Psalm xl. 6–8. (With which cp. the famous versions of Aquila, ὠτία δὲ ἔσκαψάς μοι· Symmachus, ὠτία δὲ κατεσκεύασάς μοι· Theodotion, ὠτία δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι· LXX, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι·)
„ 8–9, cp. ibid.
„ 16–17, Jer. xxxi. 31–34. (But slightly varied from the same reference above in Heb. viii. 8–12.)
„ 30, (Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις) Deut. xxxii. 35.
„ 38, Habakkuk ii. 4.
„ XII. 5, cp. Prov. iii. 11–12.
„ 20, Ex. xix. 13.
„ 26, Haggai ii. 6.
„ XIII. 5, Joshua i. 5, and Gen. xxviii. 15.

Thus we can reckon no more than a third of these references as traceable to any exact version of the Jewish Scripture; but, most remarkably, two at least of them may be identified elsewhere.

In chap. x. 30, quoting Deut. xxxii. 34, the writer says: οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα· Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος· The same words, letter for letter, are used in Rom. xii. 19.

Again, in Heb. x. 38, we meet with the hard extract from Habakkuk ii. 4: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· The like quotation is in Romans i. 17.[1]

Here surely are coincidences which show that the writer of the letter to the Hebrews must have been acquainted with

[1] Note further, that the reference to Isaac, in the same Epistle, ix. 7, from Genesis xxi. 12—this time a transliteration from the Septuagint—is repeated in Hebrews xi. 18.

Digitized by Google

the author of that to the Romans; so well, indeed, that certain favourite texts of the latter were impressed in their literal order on his mind. And we may extend our field of witness to another Scripture, and that also confessedly by S. Paul; for we presume there is now no need to vindicate his authorship of the Roman and Corinthian Epistles. In the 2 Cor. vi. 18 is written, Ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. But we shall search in vain for the identical terms of this divine assurance, and must consider it rather as a gloss upon 1 Chron. xxii. 10: καὶ οὗτος ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν, κἀγὼ αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα. And the same passage is clearly present to the mind of the writer to the Hebrews when, in chap. i. 5, he argues from God's promise, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν. But would not an Hellenistic scholar, like Apollos, have quoted correctly texts familiar to himself in what to him was the unrivalled LXX version, although he had heard them otherwise rendered by the apt and glowing tongue of a disciple of Gamaliel? In fact, the critical habit of Alexandria, and the *odium scholasticum* between it and the Talmudists, would have resented such inexact references to the Hebrew, and their equal divergence from its received Greek equivalent. Fain, therefore, would we trace in these undesigned coincidences an additional mark of the handiwork of S. Paul.

There are, however, difficulties of the subject matter which militate against this hypothesis; and it is not given to us to remove them. The golden altar of incense, according to Ex. xxx. 6, was not to be in the Holy of Holies at all, but 'before the vail that is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy-seat that is over the testimony;' and if θυματήριον in Heb. ix. 4, be construed 'altar of incense,' the statement is hopelessly in conflict with the fact. But the word may, with more reasonableness, be taken to mean 'censer,'[1] and then its adjective 'golden' becomes a help and not a hindrance. For we learn from the Mischna that the ordinary silver censer gave place on the Day of Atonement to a *thuribulum rutilante auro coruscans*, and that the brilliant metal shone blood-red, as of sacrifice. Here then seems to be a solution of the problem, far better than the laboured explanation that the altar was so connected in thought with the sanctuary as to be considered part thereof by the writer of this Epistle.

But next, the statement that in the ark 'was the golden

[1] Cp. Grimm, '*Thuribulum*.'

Digitized by Google

pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant,' has to be squared with the historic record that only the latter were found therein: 'There was nothing in the ark, save the two tables of stone' (1 Kings viii. 9, and similarly 2 Chron. v. 16). Some divines would have us understand from Ex. xvi. 33, and Num. xvii. 10, that all were originally there; and such may have been the case; but the proof thereof is not apparent. And to many a thoughtful reader the passage has seemed so dubious that he has re-echoed the words of Cajetanus, '*Igitur aut mentitur Paulus; aut hujus epistolæ auctor non est.*' To call the express narration of the Temple furniture in chapter ix. 2-5 'general allusions' may be termed evasion rather than explanation; yet this would seem to be the plainest path out of the maze: and we should remember how the writer himself said distinctly (*ibid.* 5) that he could not then treat of them *κατὰ μέρος*, 'in particular.'

Again, in like manner, in verse 8, he speaks summarily of the first tabernacle as still standing; with regard to which statement the best conclusion surely must be that he is contrasting the old covenant with the new, the earthly temple with the heavenly, and for this purpose would gather together in one all aspects of the Jewish worship, whether in the tent or the Temple. To insist, as some would have us, that the building of Solomon is here referred to, because that of Herod contained neither ark, tables of the law, cherubim, nor mercy-seat, is to spoil the spirit of the whole comparison, and to sacrifice doctrine to exegesis. The further 'attempt of Wieseler,' quoted by Dr. Moulton,[1] 'to show that in the descriptions of chapter ix. the writer had in mind, not the Tabernacle or the Temple of Jerusalem, but the temple built by Onias at Leontopolis,' may be 'ingenious,' but can hardly commend itself to others less enamoured of German ways. The spirituality of the scene which crowded on the seer—apostolic surely, whosoever he may be—had no error or confusion in its glorious comparisons of the future with the past; although by our lesser apprehension they have been coldly examined and proclaimed a delusion. And, apart from all mystical interpretation whatever, the plain rendering of the Greek (ix. 6-10) confirms our belief in this wider range of vision; and ought to have removed it altogether from the reach of factious criticism.

Thus, then, the reconciliation of these conflicting texts is by no means desperate; and, if such be allowed, there remains

[1] p. 280.

Digitized by Google

no unanswerable objection to the name of the Great Apostle. Passing rapidly over all the arguments for and against every writer whose admirers have sought for him the unique honour of this Epistle, we are almost inclined to think that destructive criticism may be hurled at each in turn, while the opposing advocates themselves rest mutually unconvinced of this singularly fatal effect. But, when all has been duly pondered, the decisions acknowledged to be vague, 'the question admitted to be as open now as in the second century,' the balance of evidence is presumably, and the weight of tradition undeniably, in favour of S. Paul.

Amongst later commentators, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Owen, Mill, Carpzov, Andrew Cramer, Lardner, Wordsworth, Forster, Stuart, and Conybeare, alike refer the authorship to him; these with the earlier theologians, whom we have already mentioned, are a phalanx formidable still, in spite of the brilliant opposition on behalf of Apollos led by Alford, and upheld, *pro viribus*, by the wielders of his refurbished weapons at the present day.

But, at the most, we imagine the Paulinists will hardly contend for more than the substance of the Epistle; leaving doubtful, as from primitive times, the actual moulding of its form: and, if 'it must appear more than probable that Luke had some kind of share in the composition,'[1] we may well assent with Delitzsch that 'Luke wrote at the suggestion and in the name of Paul; and the mental product which was the result is identical with the spirit of his master.'[2]

ART. V.—HEROINES OF CHARITY.

1. *Terra Incognita.* By JOHN NICOLAS MURPHY. (London, 1873.)
2. *Mary Aikenhead: Her Life, her Work, and her Friends.* By S. A. (Dublin, 1879.)
3. *Anna, Countess zu Stolberg Wernigerode.* From the German of ARNOLD WELLMER. (London, 1873.)
4. *Sister Dora.* By MARGARET LONSDALE. (London, 1880.)

THE last book on our list is so complete a proof of the benefit of opening the field of nursing to trained and dedicated ladies

[1] Vol. ii. 409. [2] *Ibid.* 413.

Digitized by Google

that the present generation is apt to forget the severe struggle which preceded the recognition of active sisterhoods.

Even in lands full of convents, there was great difficulty in the commencement of such orders. S. Francis de Sales had intended his Order of the Visitation to minister to the sick in their homes, but was obliged to give up the scheme, at the special desire of his Metropolitan, who was scandalized at the idea of uncloistered nuns. S. Vincent de Paul, living in the midst of crying needs, succeeded by finding the women and setting them to work before he bound them together as a religious order and obtained sanction for its existence. Indeed, the Southern nature is slow to accept active service as a duty, and we have seen it stated that most of the Sisters of Charity employed in Spain are French, while those on missions (as the Chinese massacre showed) are chiefly French and Irish.

Northern women are far more ready to take Martha's part, or, as Dante puts it, to cull flowers with Leah for the Master's garland. Holland had begun her Béguines two centuries before S. Vincent lived, and Queen Philippa among ourselves made provision at S. Katherine's for something analogous to work among the river-side poor. But there had been nothing extensive or useful enough done to establish a public opinion in their favour before the Reformation; and long afterwards in England an active sister was regarded as only a less pitiable object than a contemplative one.

However, demand could not but create supply, and the Sisters of S. Vincent de Paul were a standing witness what that supply ought to be. There has been time for heroines of the cause of charity to 'mould in calm completeness the statue of their lives,' and to show us what they were in themselves, as well as what they did. We propose to set before our readers a few outlines of the lives of these devoted women in Ireland, Germany and England—Roman, Lutheran, and Anglican.

First, in point of date, and with the hardest struggle before her, stands the Irish Honora Nagle; for though her efforts tended more to education than to the care of the sick, still she was the pioneer of the whole work of active sisterhoods in Ireland. She was born in 1728, at Ballygriffin near Mallow, of an old Jacobite and Roman Catholic family, who had nevertheless contrived to retain their estates. These were the most depressed times of the Irish. Mass was absolutely prohibited, and so was all school-teaching in public or private by any Romanist, except in the actual household, nor could

Digitized by Google

parents send their children abroad without becoming liable to heavy penalties. Mr. Nagle, however, ventured to dare these by sending his daughter to be bred up in a convent at Paris, and before her return, a terrible accident, namely, the fall of the floor of a hayloft, where mass was being celebrated, had so shocked Lord Chesterfield, the Viceroy, that he had relaxed the penal laws, and permitted the chapels to be re-opened. Education, however, was as absolutely forbidden as ever to the Roman Catholic, while the statute which had commanded that every parish of the Reformed Church should have its school had been from the first a dead letter, so that there was absolute savage ignorance of even the rudiments of Christianity, and to the Roman Catholic Church the poor clung with the vehemence of national feeling.

Nano Nagle, as she was usually called, spent a few years in the ordinary gaieties of a young lady. She was at Paris in 1750, and there, returning from a ball in the early daylight of a summer morning, she was struck by the sight of a crowd of poor people assembled round the unopened door of a church, waiting to hear mass before going to their daily work. The girl, then twenty-two, began thinking over the contrast between these pious folks and her own neglected countrymen. It is likely that she ascribed far more devotion and enlightenment to these Parisian poor than was truly theirs; but still it is remarkable to see how the glow in the dying embers of religion in one country served to kindle a flame in another. She dwelt on the thought, and finally formed a resolution to attempt something. An invitation from a brother to live in Cork with him enabled her to take the first step, and we will transcribe her own account of her commencement in a letter written many years later, in 1769:—

'When I arrived I kept my design a profound secret, as I knew if it were spoken of I should meet with opposition on every side, particularly from my own immediate family, as to all appearance they would suffer from it. My confessor was the only person I told of it, and as I could not appear in the affair, I sent my maid to get a good mistress, and to take in thirty poor girls. When the little school was settled, I used to steal there in the morning. My brother thought I was at the chapel. This passed on very well until one day a poor man came to him to speak to me to take his child into my school, on which he came in to his wife and me, laughing at the conceit of a man who was mad, and thought I was in the situation of a school-mistress. Then I owned that I had set up a school, on which he fell into a violent passion, and said a vast deal on the bad consequences that may follow. His wife is very zealous and so is he, but worldly interests blinded him at first. He was soon reconciled to it. He was.

Digitized by Google

not the person I most dreaded would be brought into trouble by it; it was my uncle Nagle, who is, I think, the most disliked by the Protestants of any Catholic in the kingdom . . . When he heard of it he was not at all angry about it, and in a little time they were so good as largely to support it. At present I have two schools for boys and five for girls . . . I prepare a set for first communion twice a year, and I may truly say it is the only thing that gives me any trouble. In the first place I think myself very incapable, and in the beginning, being obliged to speak for four hours, and my chest not being so strong as it had been, I spat blood, which I took care to conceal for fear of being prevented from instructing the poor. It has not the least bad effect now. When I have done preparing them at each end of the town, I feel myself like an idler that has nothing to do . . . I explain the catechism as well as I can, in one school or another every day.'—*Terra Incognita*, p. 14.

Miss Nagle's powers, however, being surpassed by the work she had thus set on foot, and the hæmorrhage having returned, she determined to make provision for present and future needs; and four young ladies whom she had influenced went to Paris in 1769 to be trained by the educational Order of Ursulines, while Miss Nagle, who had inherited considerable means from her uncle, built a house for their reception in Douglas Street, Cork. There was nothing to distinguish it from an ordinary dwelling, for the undertaking was perilous in the existing state of the law. No French Ursuline would consent to accompany the four when they returned, as novices, and they were in difficulties respecting a Superior, till an already professed Irish nun from Dieppe, named Margaret Kelly, volunteered to come with them, knowing as they all did that they might at any time be arrested, imprisoned, sent out of the island, and the property forfeited. They durst not wear the dress of their order, but they began its essential duties, receiving twelve girls of the higher classes as boarders for education, and taking charge of an adjacent poor school of Miss Nagle's.

Every magistrate conniving at the existence of such an establishment, or of a convent of any sort, was liable to a fine of 100*l.*, to be paid half to the Crown, half to the informer, and he was further disabled for life from holding the office of justice of the peace. The Town Council of Cork were, therefore, much exercised in mind when they became aware of what was going on in Douglas Street. At first all agreed that there was no choice but to put down the nuns. However, Alderman Carleton took up their defence, declaring (oh! convincing argument to a town councillor) that the trade of the town was benefited by the daughters of wealthy families being boarded

Digitized by Google

there instead of being sent to France, and ridiculing the idea that the Protestant Succession could be endangered by 'a few ladies living together, to teach poor children, drink tea, and say their prayers.' It was a case in which the severity of a law enacted in a panic (it bore the date William III. 9) became a dead letter, and the nuns were unmolested, although it was eight years before they ventured to wear their habit, except with closed doors.

A few months' experience had, however, shown 'Nano' that she had made a mistake. The primary work of Ursulines was the education of the rich, not the poor, and though the sisters gave her very efficient assistance, they could not, according to their rule, take up the kind of work for which she had imported them. With untiring energy, although fifty years old, and with declining health, she gathered a fresh band of ladies, whose work was to be looking after poor girls, inducing them to go to school, giving them religious instruction, visiting and relieving the sick poor at home and in the hospitals. She lived with them in another house in Douglas Street, and on Christmas day, 1777, they were sanctioned by their bishop as the Society of the Presentation of Our Blessed Lady in the Temple. Close beside their house, Miss Nagle further built an asylum for aged women, where forty were accommodated and tenderly nursed by the sisters. Worn out by incessant labours, Honora Nagle died, in her fifty-sixth year, on April 26, 1784; but her work has lived after her, and after a hundred years the Ursulines are still educating one class of girls, and the Sisters of the Presentation keeping many of the best schools for the poor, in Ireland, as well as tending their old women, in the same house which their foundress built.

On the 19th of January, 1787, three years after this foremost in the good work had passed away, was born Mary Frances Aikenhead, in the same city of Cork. She was the daughter of a physician, a Protestant of Scottish extraction. Though his wife was Roman Catholic, his family were all brought up in his own Church, or were supposed by him so to be; for, in fact, the little Mary was carried privately to an Irish priest by her nurse and baptized by him; according to a very frequent practice of attached Irish servants, whose motives of piety overpowered all sense of trustworthiness. This nurse and her husband had the sole charge of the child, who was bred up in their cottage outside the town for the first six years of her life, joined them when they said the rosary at night, and went to mass with them on Sunday. They were good and honest people, and when little Mary was at length

Digitized by Google

taken home, both her foster parents accompanied her 'to help to rear the children.'

Mary went to school, and to church with her father, and she must have learnt some of the controversial points, for she said to her nurse, 'Don't say any more prayers for me on the small beads; say them only on the large ones,' thus showing that she perceived the difference between the Pater and the Ave. There was, however, nothing to cultivate these perceptions; the Irish Church was at the lowest ebb of doctrine and practice, and to many the form of religious profession was a question of earnestness or of worldly policy. The Evangelical revival had scarcely begun even in England, and there was nothing to contend against the *prestige* of a national persecuted Church, which had been able to produce such women as Nano Nagle and her coadjutors. The generosity and high spirit of Mary Aikenhead alike inclined her to the side where lay her oldest and fondest associations. The severities used in putting down the Irish Rebellion enhanced her national feeling; although in Cork all was comparatively quiet, the Roman Catholic Bishop, Dr. Moylan, having exerted himself to preserve the loyalty of his flock so effectually that in acknowledgment the Corporation presented him with the freedom of the city in a silver box.

Dr. Aikenhead, in spite of his Scotch descent, had become thoroughly Irish, and on his death-bed in 1801 was received into the Roman Church, with how much conviction or desire on his own part must be as doubtful as in all similar cases. Of the genuine conversion of his daughter in the course of the ensuing summer there could be no doubt; and it must be laid to the charge of the torpor of the one Church in contrast with the vigour of the other. Mary Aikenhead was then sixteen, handsome (though, judging by the two portraits, not half so beautiful as in her later years), and with brilliant wit and high abilities, which made her a delightful and popular member of the best society in her native city. She was a first-rate dancer, and no assembly was complete without her, though her figure was considered as too full for the contemporary ideas of beauty, which expected a young lady to have a 'sylph-like form.' The gaieties were simple and merry, not protracted so late as to murder sleep, and while the chaperons were carried home in their sedans, the young girls, pinning up their tight muslin dresses, trudged home in their pattens, with man or maid carrying their lantern.

Mary's mornings, in company with her friend, Cecilia Lynch, were spent in charitable rounds among the destitute.

Digitized by Google

A sermon on the parable of Dives and Lazarus had powerfully affected her, and suggested the great thought of her life, drawing her more and more as she grew up to the desire to devote herself wholly to the service of God through the sick and suffering poor.

The Ursulines and the Society of the Presentation were the only religious orders in Cork, and she had many friends and relations among them. But her mind was specially bent on the aid of the sick, and she paused. Her friend Cecilia Lynch thought of entering the Order of Poor Clares, who had a romantic history. They had made their first entrance into Ireland as early as 1625, and had begun with a house at Dublin. This was broken up by the Lord Deputy, and the nuns had to return to their homes, but came together again on an island in Lough Rea, on the Shannon. There they were harried in 1641 by the Roundheads, and had to flee in boats by the light of their burning convent. The corporation of Galway gave them another island, whence they were again driven by Cromwell, but they came back and kept a school in Galway, gradually striking root there and sending out branches in every direction. In 1736, two of the sisters accomplished Jeanie Deans' feat, travelling to London to see Queen Caroline in order to obtain a grant of land on their island, which belonged to the Crown. They succeeded, through one of the Ladies of the Bedchamber who was cousin to one of them. Miss Cailly, one of their number, was a friend of Mrs. Delany, who exchanged visits with her, but cautiously, as 'people were offended if nuns were taken notice of.'

They had a house at Harold's Cross, and Cecilia was very anxious that her friend should see it before making any final decision. Mrs. O'Brien, a Dublin lady, who had come to witness the profession of her sister as an Ursuline, invited Miss Aikenhead to visit her at home, and this was the beginning of a lifelong friendship between the two women, both young, beautiful, and attractive, but both with hearts fixed on higher things. Here Mary became acquainted with Dr. Daniel Murray, then curate of a chapel in Liffey Street. On his appointment to be coadjutor to the Archbishop of Dublin, he began to consider the scheme of bringing Sisters of Charity into Ireland, and the hope of becoming one of them instantly decided her to wait till his plans were matured, and also, as her mother was now dead, till her younger sisters could spare her.

Dr. Murray soon made up his mind that no one was so fitted to lead the undertaking as Miss Aikenhead, and on his

Digitized by Google

mentioning it to her she begged that she might first have some training in the life and discipline of a religious community. A convent at Micklegate, York, was fixed upon for the purpose, because the nuns were not cloistered, and could visit the sick. Here Mary Aikenhead and a friend fourteen years older were admitted in 1812, Mary being then in her twenty-fifth year. The journey, on which Dr. Murray escorted them, was their sole experience beyond their native island. They spent two years at York, where the Superior gave them every facility in her power both of practical and theoretical study.

Meantime Dr. Murray had gone to Rome in company with Dr. Milner, Bishop of Melipotamus and historian of Winchester, to congratulate the Pope on his restoration in 1814, to consult on various matters, and to obtain sanction for his new foundation. There were several difficulties in the way. Pius VII. was under deep obligations to the British Government, which had offered him an asylum in the time of danger, and kept a man-of-war ready to carry him to it; and which, so far from profiting by his poverty to purchase the Roman art-treasures placed in the Louvre, had advanced a sum to enable them to be carried home. It was feared that he might hesitate to favour the Irish Roman Catholics out of deference to the Prince Regent; and when the fear proved groundless, the authorities wished the Irish Sisters to belong to the Order of S. Vincent de Paul, to be subject to their Superior-general, and to be trained by French Sisters, three of whom were to be always in Ireland for the purpose.

Sister Mary Augustine, as she was called in her convent life, viewed this plan as unsuited to the objects of the order, and finally the Irish Sisters were permitted to be independent and to model their own rule, which follows that of S. Ignatius, not that of S. Vincent, and thus makes the vows perpetual.

On September 1, 1815, the new foundation commenced in a house in William Street, Dublin, which had been enlarged and prepared by a friend of Mrs. O'Brien. Mary and her companion were the two first professed sisters, becoming henceforth Sisters Augustine and Catherine, while the title Mistress was added to the surname for the outer world. One postulant, Catherine Clynch, joined them at once, and four or five more soon followed. They began by receiving fourteen orphans, and teaching in the schools, as well as going to nurse the sick in their homes. The first few years fell the most severely on them. The work grew on them faster than their means or their numbers, and the sisters, all delicately nurtured

Digitized by Google

ladies, found their strength heavily taxed. In the first two years, three young and most valuable sisters died, one from fever and two from consumption, and this was not encouraging to the families of other women who might wish to devote themselves. The strain, therefore, on the old members became extremely severe. For her own part the reverend mother met the emergency by doing the duty of several offices. She was Superior and she was Novice Mistress in the place of Mother Catherine, who had to be relieved. She went on the sick mission, and when she returned after the round of the lanes she would take up the duty of an ailing or an absent sister. Oftentimes she went to the kitchen and dressed the dinner for the whole community. This last avocation unfortunately did not always greatly tax her skill, for even under the most careful management commons sometimes ran short, and there was a period when the dinner in the William Street Convent consisted, on two days in the week, of nothing better than the oatmeal porridge,

'commonly called stirabout. One day when all the sisters were out, the Rev. Mother thought the opportunity a good one for scouring the stairs. She was in the midst of the work with her sleeves turned up, her long skirt pinned back, and a capacious checked apron covering her habit, when a ring at the door summoned her from her pail. Descending forthwith to answer the call, she found that a Right Rev. Prelate wished to know was the Superioress of the Sisters of Charity at home. She at once ushered in the visitor and retired, saying that the Rev. Mother would be with him presently. In two or three minutes the apron was removed, the train let down, and everything set right, and Mrs. Aikenhead made her appearance to hold high converse with his lordship, who seemed not to have the least suspicion of the sudden transformation that had taken place from the hard-worked serving sister to the dignified and elegant Mother Superior.'—*M. Aikenhead*, p. 167.

The varied toils, anxieties, and losses did not break her spirits, but they told upon her health, and her strength soon was found to be unequal to such physical labours; yet she could always direct her sisters, whose numbers and cares alike increased, as they were invited to attend to schools and hospitals in Dublin, and even to visit women in the condemned cell. Mrs. Aikenhead and Mrs. Walsh in 1821 had this last painful office. They remained in the cells of two poor women condemned for murder until the moment of the summons to execution, and then waited praying two hours longer. A Refuge was added to the establishment, and laundry and needlework had to be taught and superintended

Digitized by Google

by the sisters. A second and much larger house in Stanhope Street was obtained, whither the Mother removed; and she had the pleasure of establishing another branch in her native city of Cork, and filling her old nurse with ecstasy by a visit to her cabin.

There awaited the sisters newly fixed in Cork one of those fearful ordeals which from time to time convince the world of the value of such institutions. Typhus, amounting to a pestilence, was raging in the town when the walking nuns, as the poor called them, five in number, came among them. Two were quickly seized by the malady, and though they recovered, one, a younger sister of Mary Aikenhead's own, immediately fell into a decline, and died six months later. Several others likewise broke down, and in 1831 the Mother herself became a confirmed invalid. Her case was misunderstood by her physician, who took spinal irritation for cancer, and treated her with mercury, hemlock, turpentine and iodine, till at last the apothecary, who was wont to say that Mrs. Aikenhead had 'a heart as big as the Rotunda, and a head to match,' made a characteristic remonstrance: 'Ladies, you may get any one you choose to make up these medicines: I will have nothing to do with them. Reverend Mother is being poisoned!' By his advice Dr. Joseph O'Ferrall was called in, and for twenty-seven years more this physician was the Mother's constant attendant and valued friend. Under his care, after years of lying prostrate in bed, she recovered a certain degree of health and power of locomotion, but she never again had strength for active labour.

Her doctor's history is too curious to be entirely passed over. His mother was a young lady, bred up by a Protestant uncle, but secretly converted by a Romish priest. On the discovery, her relations actually turned her out of the house and refused to have anything more to do with her. She went at once to the priest, and he, knowing of no other means of providing for her, asked whether she would consent to be married to a humble old barber, poor but good, kindly and respectable. She consented, saying that it was what the Blessed Virgin had done, and she was not unhappy during the few years that her husband lived. After his death her uncle, meeting her and her boy by accident, renewed his intercourse with her, and provided for the education of her son, who embraced the medical profession, and was just becoming well known when he was called in to Mrs. Aikenhead.

It was in the height of her illness that Ireland was visited by the cholera of 1832. A penitentiary in Grange Gorman

Digitized by Google

Lane was converted into a hospital, and placed under charge of the sisters, and Archbishop Murray issued an address intended to persuade the sufferers readily to yield themselves to treatment there. The virulence of the disease at first was frightful, and death ensued so rapidly that the sisters counted eight successive occupants of a single bed within twenty-four hours. From fifty to eighty patients died each day, and there were times when all that the chaplain could do was to read the Office for Extreme Unction in the middle of a ward, after which the sisters showed him the patients at the last gasp, and he went from bed to bed to anoint them. The paid nurses, mostly of the lowest class of women, took the night work, but were often carried out corpses in the morning. The sisters, going at eight, hurrying home for dinner, and then returning at nightfall, and being careful to change their clothes and steep them in chloride of lime, entirely escaped the malady, all but one. This one had heard in the morning of her mother's death from cholera; but she would not desist from her work, and was herself stricken down in the course of the day, though she ultimately recovered.

There was the same scene at Cork, but there the people turned against the doctors, and would accept nothing from them, though they would do anything for the 'walking nuns.' Sometimes so fierce a throng surrounded the hospital that the curious sight was seen of the physicians passing out, dodging behind the sisters and clinging to their cloaks for protection. The howls and lamentations of the relations, and their bitter distrust of, and violence against, the medical men were terrible elements in this visitation, and much increased the labours of the clergy and the sisters. Care had also to be taken of the convalescent, and provision to be made for the widows and orphans, and though large collections were made, the executive part for the most part fell on the sisters.

In everything the directing head was the Mother in her bed at the small convent lately given to the sisterhood at Sandymount, Dublin. There she lay, often in much pain, and unable to stand or sit up without severe suffering, often spending many hours alone, as she would not suffer the sisters' time to be spent in waiting on her, but managing everything, writing long letters full of minute directions and lively amusing remarks, keeping the accounts, and beguiling times of pain with books. She had all Scott's novels at her fingers' ends, and kept up full acquaintance with current literature. She was a thoroughly large-minded woman, and had both good sense and a strong sense of the humorous,

Digitized by Google

and her room was often a place of merriment when the sisters came in with their quaint experiences, as well as of tender but bracing sympathy with all their difficulties.

Her great scheme was the foundation of a hospital, to be under the special care of the sisterhood. 3,000*l.* contributed by one of their number formed a nest-egg, and purchased a house in Stephen's Green, and three sisters were sent to Paris to study hospital-nursing. Legacies, donations, and collections were gathered, and the Mother, on her bed at Sandymount, stitched away at the sheets and other linen in preparation. She moved into the new house as soon as three rooms were habitable. One was fitted up for an oratory, another was the Mother's room, a third was divided for the sisters by hanging horse-rugs upon rods, and was, besides, general store-room, kitchen, scullery, refectory, and community room. The friends of the sisters were always sending them presents, and sometimes there would be seen a brace of wild fowl or a pine-apple suspended from the iron rods of the bedsteads, together with artificial flowers, intended, according to questionable taste, for the oratory.

S. Vincent's Hospital, as it was called, was opened in April 1835 with twelve beds, although only 20*l.* a year was certain for their support. But contributions came in, fresh wards were opened, and by the end of the first year forty women and children at a time were provided for. The next year, by fitting up a stable and hayloft, room was made for twenty men, and with these sixty patients, the sisters went on for five years, until an opportunity offered of buying the adjoining premises, where, in the days before the Union, the Lords of Westmeath had held high revel in a splendid ball-room and banqueting hall. Just as it had been purchased, all the building fell down except these two chambers, and Mrs. Aikenhead rejoiced that it had come down. 'It was really the right thing,' she said, 'but I should have been considered deranged if I had done it.'

The work cost 8,000*l.*, which was raised by contributions, sermons, bazaars, and every possible engine for collecting money, in which Mrs. Aikenhead toiled indefatigably on her couch, attending to everything in turn, from the architect's plans to the dress of a little doll for a bazaar, and all with her strong deep common-sense and dutifulness. One of her sisters writes:—

'Even while speaking to you, she would be busy folding papers, or turning envelopes, or making little fancy boxes for the country houses as presents for the poor. When I was applying for admission

Digitized by Google

to the congregation, I went to visit her at S. Vincent's Hospital, which was then only in the beginning, and was shown into her private room, where I found the Superior-General seated, with a quantity of spoons on the table before her. They were all of Britannia metal, and she was employed in engraving a cross upon them with a pin, which was intended to mark them as belonging to the Congregation. I was wonderstruck at finding her at this humble work. She at once saw by my countenance that I was astonished, and handing me one of the spoons to look at, she said, "My child, it is very little matter what we are doing for God, provided we are doing it in the best possible way we can. And what would you say if I sent you to pick straws for the Congregation?" These few words gave me a high view of the value of purity of intention in the smallest and most indifferent actions, and a feeling that I cared not what I was employed in if it were for God. And as she paid great attention to small things herself, she likewise required the same exactness in those under her. A lay sister, who had charge of the halls and parlours, had erroneous ideas of recollection, and thought it necessary to keep her eyes down. Rev. Mother met her one day in the hall, when, as usual, her eyes were on the floor. "Biddy, I don't like people who always look down," said she. "Look up, child," she added, pointing with her finger to a large cobweb which was hanging from the ceiling. Biddy looked up in utter amazement. "And now, my child," continued the Rev. Mother, "if you looked up more to the heavens, you would do your work in a more perfect way for God." No doubt Biddy looked better after the cobwebs thenceforth. Mrs. Aikenhead was never tired inculcating the duty of being always employed, and the necessity of doing everything well, whether great or small. She had a natural tendency to the ridiculous, and could give a most appropriate and humorous answer after her own fashion. For instance, when a sister would begin to lament the perversity of the young flock entrusted to her charge, and the difficulty of making them go the right way, she would look at her a long while, and then say, archly, "Thank God, my child, in all the bad things we ever did, we didn't marry."'—*Aikenhead*, p. 246.

This reminds us of S. Francis de Sales's rebuke to his brother and coadjutor, who was fretful at having been kept waiting for dinner, and blamed the good bishop for letting himself be at the beck and call of every old woman in the diocese. 'My brother, there is at least one woman who is very much obliged to you—' and while Jean de Sales waited for some charming trait of gratitude—'I mean the woman who would have been your wife.'

Good sense was a quality she specially cultivated. She had a great dislike to *fuss*, and would set down a sister who fretted every one by discussions about her own peculiar patient, with 'My child, you want to keep a priest in one pocket and a doctor in the other. We don't want children here,' she said,

Digitized by Google

'we want young women who have sense and know how to use it.' A visitor observed that the sisters' countenances gave her the idea of having a man's breadth of mind, not the narrowness of a convent, impressed on them. 'Yes,' was the reply, 'the great old Mother sets her stamp on them all.' She would not let them fall into what she termed creep-about ways, or walk about in the town with heads bent and eyes on the pavement, and even at church she wished them only to bow at special moments, but at others to kneel upright; and would take no pious contemplation as an excuse for neglected duty. The sisters of Bethany, she said, were to be united in one, but not so as to interfere with each other. 'Perfection consists in doing ordinary actions in a perfect manner,' she said, 'doing each with the full bent of the powers of the soul.' To those who did stupid or foolish things while they thought themselves cultivating piety she gave the name of 'holy pokers,' and would speak sharply about negligence. The sister in charge of the store-room came in to say, 'The wind blew high last night, and I found the two Cork crockery pans on the floor; I left them in the window and the wind blew them in.' 'My heart!' said the Mother, 'come here. Where is the humility of a Sister of Charity? You put, as it were, the fault on God Almighty, when you ought to have placed such valuable articles on the floor.'

She did sometimes speak sharply, especially at self-neglect or inattention to their own health on the part of the sisters. But tears distressed her much, and if she thought she had been too severe, she would say she had been combing her child's head with a three-legged stool. Her old friend, Alicia Lynch, coming in after thirty years' separation from the Poor Clares' convent to be attended for a severe and eventually fatal malady, was amazed at her decision and command, and was heard to say, 'Can this be gentle Mary Aikenhead?' The sisters, however, all felt that the sweet forgiveness made up for the rebuke, even when, owing to the mother's physical state, there was uncontrollable irritability of nerves and temper. The slamming of a door, or even the sense that something was going amiss, would often cause her intolerable pain: but she was always the first to see when she had shown the least hastiness or injustice, and would make amends in the most touching way, so that the sisters could hardly bear to hear the Mother humbling herself. Indeed, she took great pains to practise self-restraint, and as time went on conquered back again her old gentleness.

She was in constant suffering, but never mentioned it, unless

Digitized by Google

perhaps the sister in attendance would inquire if she were in pain. She would answer, 'Oh yes, child, in the greatest, but the good doctor will mend us up, and God will get another turn out of us.' Or: 'Ah! how could I be, my dear child, but like a crock that you may have seen in the country tied with cords, and kept together by careful handling. Only for the charity and attentive care of the sisters I should have long since have come asunder. So now, that's what your old Mother is—a cracked vessel.'

The submission was perfect. Once, when in extreme distress about some disaster to the community, the sister who was attending on her never heard a murmur nor a word of censure of the person who had done the injury. Only now and then a breathing forth of 'Not my will, but Thine,' or '*Fiat, fiat, fiat.*' If she saw others anxious about ways and means, she would gently say, 'Why distrust the sweet Providence of God?'

She did not, however, neglect the due precautions for the supply of her great network of institutions. She always insisted on the sisters bringing their dower, as stipulated, although she returned it to the families if they were necessitous; and she was a capital woman of business, expecting her young Superiors to be the same, and making them so. She likewise would have none but ladies as professed sisters, being practically aware how seldom, in the British Isles at least, the peculiar conjunction of qualities needed for the work of sisterhoods is to be found without gentle blood and breeding.

Strange to say, in spite of all the exertions of the sisters, through the years of famine, fever, and cholera, as well as their daily work, there was not a single death among them after the first three in their earlier years, till 1851, when one of the original band, Mrs. Clynch, died in her eightieth year, having seen the institution spread from four sisters to hundreds, and the foundation reach from Dublin to America and Australia. The next year took away the friend of Mrs. Aikenhead's whole life, Archbishop Murray, and then soon followed her companion in training, Mother Catherine Walsh. The Mother felt these losses deeply, and shed many tears over them. 'Nature would have its way,' as the warm-hearted Irishwoman said of herself, and her buoyant spirit did not sink. Her bedroom, hung round with choice engravings, was still a centre of cheerfulness to the house, and she thoroughly enjoyed both reading and conversation. She knew where every book was, and was specially fond of Vertot's *Knights of Malta.* She tried to make her attendant lay sister, Monica,

Digitized by Google

read Miss Strickland's *Queens of England*, but the good woman was so much scandalized by some of them that she brought the book back. 'Queens indeed!' said she, 'I'd call them blackguards! I'll have nothing to do with them.' This same Monica often diverted the sisters by her simplicity. In she ran one day with the tidings, 'Sure, Peel is out!' 'Out of what?' asked a sister. 'Faith! I don't know. Out of prison, I suppose.'

The last great pleasure that the Mother had was the gift of Benada Abbey, in County Sligo, an old foundation of the Friars Eremites, which had been granted away to a family named Jones. The last of the family all went into religious orders, the eldest son becoming a Jesuit, and three sisters joining the Sisterhood of Mercy. The Abbey, with 900 acres, was made over to the Congregation in 1858, to serve as a great orphanage and convalescent home, with the single proviso that the widowed mother of the donors might continue to occupy her own rooms there for life.

It was with a great effort that Mrs. Aikenhead used what she called 'her poor lame pen' to sign the needful paper of acceptance. She was fast sinking. Dropsy set in, and when this abated, paralysis came on: she could not raise her head, and when she was fed, a sister had to stand behind her and hold it back. Her intellect was clear, but she suffered from that mysterious dispensation which we are allowed to trace in that great cry of 'Eloi! Eloi!' on the Cross. She prayed constantly, often the whole night, often reciting the verse, 'For with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is plenteous redemption:' but her cry was, 'Oh that I should have presumed to offend the majesty of the great God!' Her terror at communicating was extreme, and it was only in obedience to the desire of her confessor that she did so twice a week. He could not fathom her state of mind enough to aid her through this fearful loneliness, and once as he was going away, she was heard sighing, 'No comfort, no support!' Her nurse reminded her of S. Francis Xavier's absolutely solitary death, and she replied, 'True, child, true,' never speaking of it again. However, the clouds cleared away, and a time of peace and blessing set in. Two old friends, Dr. Russell and Archbishop Cullen, who understood her better, were able to come and see her, and with her fears and repentance allayed and hushed into rest the great Mother died on July 22, 1858. A farmer in the south of the island wrote to a relation, a lay sister, 'So your Rev. Mother is dead, that matchless woman? In her Ireland's poor have lost their best friend. No other woman

Digitized by Google

ever did so much for them.' The Appendix enumerates no less than twenty flourishing foundations, the children of the little house first begun in 1818.

Nor can we pass by, in our *rôle* of devoted workers, one of the deaconesses of Germany, who was a true heroine of charity, whose life has been written, a little sentimentally, in German, by Arnold Wellmer, and translated by a person who only gives the initials D.M.P. Countess Anna zu Stolberg Wernigerode belonged to a family in whom zealous piety seems to have been hereditary. A crusading poet was among their ancestry, and some of the fine hymns of Lutheranism were by another member of the family. That Count Friedrich Stolberg, who was noted for his staunch maintenance of the truth during the deadness of religion at the beginning of the century, and who was the first patron of Dr. Wolfe, had been received into the Roman Catholic Church in 1800, though he continued ardently attached to Luther's Bible, and even distributed it among his people.

Anna was born in 1819, the eighth of the numerous children of Count Anton Stolberg, who, after fighting gallantly in the German wars against Napoleon, had settled down to lead a beneficent life on his estate of Peterswaldau in Prussia. The children were brought up with great simplicity, wearing linen frocks spun in a loom in the village, and playing much in the open air; but they were carefully instructed, and their father paid much attention to their religious training. He was a friend of Pastor Fliedner, and the whole family took a warm interest in the establishment of the hospital at Kaiserswerth in 1836. No doubt Anna, then in her seventeenth year, must have received a strong impression in her visits to the growing institution.

On the accession of Friedrich Wilhelm IV. the Count received an appointment in the household, and afterwards became one of the Cabinet. There was at that time (1842) a religious atmosphere at Berlin, which produced a strong effect on the young ladies of the Stolberg family. Pastor Gossner, noted both for his power in prayer and preaching, so worked on the ladies at Berlin that the first institutions for training nurses were commenced, besides an infants' school and home mission, and three foreign missions. Germany was, in truth, partaking of that same awakening which was felt in England and France. The visit of Mrs. Fry was likewise a great epoch in the life of Anna Stolberg. As her translator says, 'the picture of the powerfully practical Quakeress never vanished from her mind.' At the same time, Fliedner had been invited to

Digitized by Google

Berlin by the King, there to found another Deaconess Mother House after the pattern of Kaiserswerth. The name of Bethany was given to it; it was built by the royal architect at the King's expense, and Fliedner was invited to spend the half of each year there; but this he declined, thinking divided service certain to be inefficient.

The first stone was laid by the King in 1844; and shortly after followed the death of Marianne, one of the Stolberg sisters. Two more shortly after died, one was already married, and three, Bertha, Anna, and Charlotte, remained at home. Their great interest at this time was the foundation of a small deaconess-home at their father's expense on his property, to be named after their sister Marianne; and their means being hardly adequate, the three sisters and their mother worked a large carpet, which was sold for a considerable sum, and they afterwards made up all the linen for the establishment, where they did much of the nursing when at home. Countess Charlotte began her training as a deaconess at the Berlin Bethany, but marriage came in her way and carried her off. Bertha and Anna both longed to devote themselves; but as one was needed to take care of the parents, now advancing in years, Bertha stayed at home, while Anna, on June 3, 1853, then in her twenty-fourth year, was presented by her parents to Marianne von Rantzau, the Mother of the Bethany at Berlin, as a probationer. The simplicity and frugality of the Stolberg family are proved by the fact that Anna never had a watch till her father gave her one on this entrance day, that she might be able to be as punctual as was required of the deaconesses.

The probationers all slept in one large room, in compartments divided by curtains, each containing a deal bedstead, a chair and a table. The bell called them to rise at half-past five, and breakfast and prayers were over, and the day-nurses had relieved the night ones, long before the outer world had left its bed. The probationer had first to work in the children's wards, then in those of the adult women; and the ladies of whatever rank shared without distinction in every kind of task. Anna was already used to such tasks, and was very happy in her work; but she was called, in the course of the year, to the death-bed of her father, the good Count Anton, who died on February 11, 1854. On her return, she found that her zeal and efficiency had led to the determination to make her a full deaconess at once, without waiting for the three years usually required. Her thanksgiving is beautiful, 'Oh may all my life be a thankoffering for such mercy!

Digitized by Google

God has called me to the dear service. He will give me grace for it. Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to Thy word.'

She was now promoted to share a room with another sister, with room for a chest of drawers, and over it a book-case, and the likenesses of her parents, sisters, and home, and over the bed was a crucifix. The Mother, Fräulein von Rantzau, had been a complete invalid for some years, and died in the January of 1855. Anna von Stolberg was, in spite of her youth, immediately elected into her place. Whether her rank had anything to do with the choice does not appear; at any rate, she thoroughly merited it, not only by the devotion of her work, but by her power of organization. This was, indeed, called forth, for in the thirteen years of her reign, the branches connected with Bethany increased from two to twenty-four, the deaconesses from fifty to three times that number, and the sick in her charge were generally three hundred at a time, while the establishment possessed large gardens, and a farm and dairy for its supply. She never failed to be present at any serious operation, and, with two assistant sisters, undertook all the help and dressing. She is said never to have lost patience, except when some young surgeon insisted on making a study of some 'interesting case,' regardless of the suffering he was causing. The leisure moments of the nursing sisters were spent in knitting and working for the poor, and at Christmas there was a grand distribution to the poor children near at hand. The next day they all came to show themselves in their new clothes, and were regaled with cake and coffee. There was a bright playfulness and motherliness about her which made Bethany a home to all the inmates.

On the outbreak of the Schleswig-Holstein war, the order of S. John, to which Sister Anna's brother, Count Eberhard, belonged, called on Bethany for help, and she, with two of her deaconesses, went under his care, and that of his wife, to organize the first field hospital at Altona. On February 6, 1864, the task began in good earnest, with eight wounded Austrians, and from that moment the toil was unremitting. For weeks the deaconesses slept in their clothes, and had barely lain down on their palliasses under a woollen rug before fresh relays of bleeding sufferers were brought in. When asked how they managed when nursing the enemy, whose language was strange to them, they answered with German fervour, 'We know no enemy. Love understands and speaks all the languages in the world.' Nor was the task uniformly

Digitized by Google

easy even with the Prussian soldiers, who did not understand the position of the deaconesses, and were sometimes insolent, insubordinate, and ungrateful; but quiet patience and offices of love did their work, and soon one of the sisters declared that the men looked to them like children to their mothers.

Another hospital was established by the order of S. John at Flensburg, whither the Mother, with another detachment from Bethany, came to receive constant relays of wounded from the battle-fields in the north, brought by the knights of the order in a vessel of their own. Anna, daughter of a long line of crusaders and warriors, entered into the excitement of the campaign enough to feel it a trial when she was obliged to return to Bethany to arrange for the nursing of the numerous wounded who had been sent thither as soon as they could bear the journey. The numbers at home were so much diminished by the parties who had been sent to the war hospitals that all hands were constantly full. The wounded of the Schleswig war were hardly recovered before the deaconesses were again summoned to the Bohemian hospitals; and such was their service in both that the King wished to decorate them with the war medal, but Anna refused this as a worldly honour. Her two brothers, Eberhard and Bolko, had toiled as unremittingly under the Red Cross, doing ambulance duty, nursing, finding supplies and means of transport, and writing letters for the wounded to their families, and Eberhard's wife had done her full share of the labour of love.

A year or two of cheerful work in the Bethany followed; but in 1867 there was a terrible outbreak of fever in East Prussia. Famine had prevailed there, in consequence of a bad season, and in April typhus broke out among the labourers on the railway between Bartenstein and Rastenberg, where they were huddled together in wretched and filthy huts. The summer was wet and the harvest bad, and the sickness increased with the famine, smouldering on, unattended to, until a hard winter set in.

'Fever, famine, cold—these three spectres appeared in the most awful way in some of the provinces shortly before Christmas, among a terribly poor population, who were quite among the lowest of the Prussian kingdom in culture or cultivation, and who spent their dull heavy lives in vegetating in ignorance and infidelity (ungodliness), and in an almost animal state of dirt. No energetic effort was made against these three spectres, who attacked the poor people with ever-increasing deadliness, and branded them with their fatal mark; no sanitary Commission attempted to root out the hunger-typhus from the plague-infested dwellings by compulsory cleaning and kind nursing and help; no police rules hindered the spread of the poison

Digitized by Google

by wandering beggars; no sufficient hospital existed. The proud town of Rastenberg, with its 5,000 inhabitants, lying on the direct railway route, called a miserable, dirty hut, in the midst of manure heaps, its county hospital. The hospital of Tapiau consisted of two small dirty rooms, in one of which lay seven hopeless cases of typhus in the most miserable beds or on filthy straw; and in the other, close beside them, only separated by a door which would not shut, lay five sick women, none of whom had typhus as yet. Their nurses were a sick man, who himself stood sorely in need of help, who could scarcely step from one bed to another, and an old weak woman.'—*Countess of Stolberg*, p. 163.

Such was the state of things that came to the ears of the modern knights of the Red Cross. At once these noble men were on the scene of distress, with doctors, beds, clothing, wine, food, and medicine, collecting subscriptions by appeals to the wealthy, and distributing the supplies themselves, fearless of infection. Count Eberhard was among the first, and in a few days he wrote: 'Anna, come and help us. Come and help us and these poor creatures.'

Bethany was full, all its 300 beds occupied, and 260 cases on hand in Berlin, in consequence of the unusually severe winter. However, the mother went with two deaconesses, and on January 17, 1868, arrived at the wretched little village of Rhein. The place was poor at all times, and the mud huts of the railway labourers had neither window nor chimney. The frost had stopped the work, and the sick and the starving, the dead and the dying, lay huddled together in a state of indescribable misery. Two doctors had gone among them, but had at once broken down and now lay sick, and one knight of S. John, named Von Tyszka, was doing his best single-handed till he had been joined by one good native of the place, a merchant named Hofer. They had engaged a house, to which they carried the 'sickest of the sick' in their own arms, at the peril of their lives; and there Anna found forty patients in two rooms, lying on straw in their filthy and vermin-covered rags. Yet these were the best off; the two good men had given them food and medicine, but could do no more in the appalling state of things around them. The villagers themselves were as wretched as the navvies: twenty or thirty of all sexes and ages, sick and well, were heaped together on a mud floor in one fireless room. 'My heart stood still when I entered these pest-holes,' said Anna. 'I never saw such human misery.' But her heart had no time to stand still. Other houses were hired and cleaned, and beds and coverings were bought. The deaconess sat up late into the night stitching at shirts and mattresses till some of the ladies in the

Digitized by Google

neighbouring town were shamed out of their previous indifference into undertaking the needlework. Sixty cases were soon under their care, and Anna went from cottage to cottage, besides her actual toil in the hospital, to persuade the people to send their sick to the hospital. But seldom would they do so before they were in a dying state; and as to cleanliness or fresh air, she might as well have preached to the winds as to the peasants when she talked of them.

Four days of this, and with the nights disturbed by the ravings of one of the sick doctors in the next room, were enough to overcome Anna's strength. The poison had entered her system, and on January 23 she was so unwell that she returned to Bethany. There she felt better for the time, saw the Queen-dowager, and described the needs of East Prussia, and went about shopping with 100 thalers, which her brother Eberhard had sent her to lay out for the poor of Rhein. Three more deaconesses were sent off, and only just in time, for her own two companions and Tyszka were all prostrate with typhus. On the 4th of February, the fourteenth anniversary of her profession, she was present for the last time at the holy communion in the chapel, together with the good old countess, her mother, and it was afterwards remembered that an expression of peace and joy shone out on her countenance in response to the words, 'Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace.'

She managed with much effort to preside at a meeting for sending some fresh succour to the sick the next day, but afterwards lay down on the bed, from which she never rose. 'Do not pray me back from the Lord,' she said to the sisters. 'But, mother, would you not wish to remain with us a little longer; we need you so much?' 'If it be the Lord's will; just what He wills,' she answered. Once or twice she said: 'I should like to know whom our dear God has chosen as my successor,' but she refrained from expressing a wish, lest it should be felt as an obligation. It was a very suffering illness: spotted typhus with inflammation on the lungs, and acute headache; but her nearest approach to a complaint was an apology to her attendant because 'her head was so very bad.' A sister whom she had once misjudged returned home at this time. Sending for her, the mother begged her forgiveness. 'You do not believe,' she said, 'how our sins stand like mountains before us at such an hour.' 'But, mother, the good God just wants poor sinners washed clean in Christ's blood.' 'That is my only comfort,' she replied: and thankfulness was her predominant spirit, saying, 'I am not worthy of the

Digitized by Google

lovingkindness and truth the Lord hath showed me. The lot has fallen to me in pleasant places, I have had a lovely home on earth.' Delirium came on at times, and she thought herself at Rhein, or trying to get home, or else she repeated hymns and prayers: and no doubt it was indeed as she said, 'Every night is like a dark valley, but the Lord is with me.' And when fatal symptoms showed themselves to her practised eye she said, 'Just one more step to my freedom.' She was set free on January 16, 1868, her two brothers praying by her bedside. She was buried beside the first Superior. The myrtle which German maidens keep for bridal or for death gave its wreath to her coffin. Beside it King William himself laid a laurel crown, for the sake of his soldiers; the two queens brought roses and camellias, and when hundreds of the high-born mourners had paid their homage, crowds of the poor stole in with streaming tears and little offerings of snowdrops or sprays of rosemary to her who had given her life to them. Truly Anna of Stolberg was the very flower of Prussian Lutheranism during that quickening of piety that took place in the last reign.

We now turn from her to the work accomplished in our own Church, though as yet we have no representative biography of a member of one of the sisterhoods which have grown up among us. The battle that was fought and won by Priscilla Lydia Sellon at Plymouth is almost an historical event. Perhaps the details may be said to prove that championship, even in the best of causes, is not a wholesome attitude for a woman, and that the conflict can only be won at the expense of some loss. At any rate, those sisterhoods which have sprung up under the wise fostering care of priests who needed their aid have been more usually successful than those with a more independent and exclusively feminine origin. Looking back, as our memory serves us, we see three different tones of feeling on the subject combining about thirty years ago. The Catholic feeling longing for the revival of religious orders in the abstract, and making penitentiary work, education, or nursing their *raison d'être:* of which Clewer, All Saints, East Grinstead and Wantage, with many lesser sisterhoods, are the visible effects. Secondly, the desire to imitate Pastor Fliedner's work in our own Church, resulting in numerous deaconess institutions, authoritatively patronized as a safe *via media*. And thirdly, the sense that nursing, the most delicate and difficult of all the special tasks of womankind, ought to be in the hands of highly-trained religious women, rather than of those who were mere nurses because they were good for

Digitized by Google

nothing else, and who often had not the ordinary virtues of sobriety and honesty. Here it was, of course, Florence Nightingale who was the pioneer, trained at Kaiserswerth herself, but taking her own line, and the S. John's nurses are the visible result. Agnes Jones was one noble specimen of a worker produced under this system: and, had we room, we would dwell on her achievements in the workhouse infirmary. Would that all such could be put under such superintendence as hers.

All these systems were making their way in England together, and the longing for practical occupation was just beginning to ferment in the minds of English young ladies, when Dorothy Pattison had passed the first stages of grown-up girlhood, and felt the passionate longing to be up and doing, which is a characteristic of this generation. Born in 1832, the youngest of ten sisters, and with two brothers besides, she certainly could plead that the family nest was full. She was a Yorkshire clergyman's daughter, with good means and able to enjoy to the full the agreeable existence of a family treated as equals in county society, partaking all the sports and pleasures of country life, and giving kindly but not absorbing attention to the poor. To a very beautiful girl, with strong limbs, high courage, and brilliant fun and humour, life must have been most delightful, and it was not till the first years of her youth were over that the longing for action and usefulness seized on her. It seems first to have taken definite form in a great desire to go out among Miss Nightingale's band of nurses; but she was only twenty-two, and her father convinced her that she was far too young and untrained to be of use. The care of an invalid mother likewise occupied her, and it was not till after that mother's death that her cravings for active service became irresistible. The terrible accidents that befall ironfounders had caused a nursing sisterhood, called the Good Samaritans, to make their head-quarters at Coatham, near Redcar. They had cottage hospitals in various places where there were foundries, and in some of them had won the gratitude and affection of their patients to a great degree. We remember at the time hearing stories of ex-patients coming to look in at their old quarters at night, and offering their services in sitting up with the inmates. It was the sisterhood that was creating an enthusiasm in the North, and Dora Pattison was attracted to it as those are who have discovered their vocation. The craving for work was all the greater, as she wanted to stifle in occupation sceptical questions on the Scriptures that had been infused into her.

Digitized by Google

Unhappily, there was a conflict of wills. Whether Mr. Pattison were prejudiced against all sisterhoods, whether he disapproved the particular regulations, or whether he perceived that his strong, high-spirited, undisciplined daughter would never accommodate herself to the rules and subordination of a sisterhood, he opposed the scheme as entirely as possible, short of an absolute prohibition, such as he did not choose to lay on a daughter of eight-and-twenty. Her resistance and wilfulness were subjects of repentance to her dying day, but when she left home it was for a sort of middle course. She became mistress of a village school at Little Woolston, in Buckinghamshire, in the autumn of 1861, living in a cottage, doing all her own cooking and housework, and visiting and nursing the sick, besides fulfilling her task as a mistress in her thoroughgoing manner. She was, however, all the time restless, ill at ease, longing for a wider sphere, and preyed upon by her doubts and by conscience: and all this, together with the strain of constant work and lack of home comforts, brought on an illness in the course of the third year. With characteristic determination she disregarded pain in her side till she could not get out of bed, and had to endure a sharp attack of pleurisy. Instead of going home to recover, she went to some friends at Redcar, where she had first known the Good Samaritans. The attraction was renewed, and she decided on joining them, her father neither consenting nor forbidding her, and she became a member of the sisterhood in the autumn of 1864. There she obtained her technical training as a nurse—her true vocation—and in 1865 she was told off to work at the accident hospital which had been established at Walsall by the Town Council. Here her value proved to be such that, with a short interval at Coatham, she remained there, as head of the establishment, independently of the sisterhood, for the rest of her life.

There has been a newspaper controversy as to the terms on which she stood with the sisterhood, and the manner of her parting with them. A painful accusation has in particular been brought by the biographer against the Good Samaritans, that she was prevented by them from attending a summons to her father's death-bed until it was too late. One of Sister Dora's fellow-workers has flatly denied the assertion; while, on the other hand, the author had it from the lips of Sister Dora herself, who suffered bitterly and took it as the just retribution for a disobedience which the 'fellow-worker' likewise denies, declaring that the consent of parents is a *sine qua non* to admission into the Society. May we not hint that the

Digitized by Google

formal consent, which may well be sufficient for an external body, may not be such as to satisfy the conscience of the child who has extorted it or implied it? Family duties are one great difficulty in the sisterhood question, and it is hard to tell how far parents have the right to check the aspirations of full-grown children, or whether the younger generation is bound to sacrifice to filial obedience the call to higher service. Still, Sister Dora's story seems to us to point the moral—trite, but therefore in the more danger of being overlooked—that the old-fashioned way of understanding the Fifth Commandment is the only safe one, and that patience is often the discipline needed by a character, however noble in itself. Three years more of deference to her parent would have enabled Sister Dora to work without the sting she carried about with her, and might have mellowed and softened the imperfections that certainly existed in her grand nature.

As to the contradictions about the neglected summons to her father's death-bed, there is a certain amount of hearsay on the one side, and on the other it is not disproved by the allegation that Sister Dora was not kept away by a case of nursing in Devonshire. There was then much that was experimental in sisterhoods, family claims had never been quite balanced, and the urgency of the call might not have been understood at head-quarters. It is quite certain that she was absent, and that this was the grief of her whole life, though it is quite another matter how far the sisterhood was to blame for it.

It is according to the analogies of the national character and customs that, while the vocation to religious charity came so readily and smoothly as it were to the Irish Roman Catholic and the German Lutheran, the one guided by the clergy, the other by her parents, the Englishwoman's nature, grandest, and noblest of all in many features, should have had to come through many a bitter struggle alike of the soul and the heart. 'With all my might,' was her true motto, and by-and-by she was 'stablished, strengthened, settled' in all joy and peace, but not until she had passed through many deep waters, enduring sufferings proportioned to the wonderful force and strength of her nature. It was to the teaching of the Reverend Robert Twigg that she always felt herself to have owed the calming of her doubts and the religious direction of her mind. She attended his Scripture classes whenever she could, and kept copious notes of them, to reproduce when digested for her patients; and she made him her guide and adviser, finding him the only person too faithful to be carried away by the uni-

Digitized by Google

versal admiration she inspired, and daring to rebuke and criticize her, making her examine her motives.

Still there was another terrible ordeal to go through. The Good Samaritans make no vows, and Dora at one time was sought in marriage by a man of high abilities but completely sceptical. Her attachment to him was vehement in proportion to every other part of her nature. It overbore everything else for the time, all thought of her work, all considerations save one, which her faithful adviser ever kept before her. Should a Christian woman be yoked with an unbeliever? Her duty to her God prevailed, and she remained Sister Dora still. Surely she was 'one that overcometh.'

Her biography is in every one's hands, so that we feel it almost superfluous to give extracts as from less known books, except so far as to place her, the heroine of our own Church, in full comparison with the other ladies whom we have described. In one point she does not seem to have been equal to either Mary Aikenhead or Countess Anna. She was no organizer. She was one of those who prefer doing all the work themselves to teaching others, and though she had at different times lady helpers under training, she never attempted to form one into a successor. However, this might have come with advancing years, which sometimes develop an instinct of training as the power of efficient personal service diminishes. Miss Lonsdale has even incurred censure for the hint that Sister Dora did not like to have a prime minister or deputy, and that during her long absence at the smallpox hospital the lack of a recognized substitute worked disadvantageously. In the enthusiasm that gratitude and admiration have excited, we can quite believe that it must have seemed invidious to acknowledge any blemish in this noble being; but we cannot help thinking that it was a wise and brave thing in the author to give her own true and faithful impressions instead of effacing them, so as to produce an ideal creature instead of a portrait, such as we have in the biography of the Deaconess Anna. Dorothy Pattison's was eminently a strong and generous nature, and it had the defects to which such natures are liable, bravely battled with and conquered where they were recognized, and thus rendering her the more truly an example.

Another great point of difference between her and the other ladies we have mentioned was their more defined position, and the sympathy of those on whom their work depended. The 'Great Mother' was the instrument of the bishop, to whom she looked up more than to any other

Digitized by Google

person, and Countess Anna presided over a royal foundation, and was already the favourite of those who put her in office; but Sister Dora's work at Walsall was chiefly dependent on a committee of manufacturers and tradesmen, with whom she had to deal partly by her personal womanly influence, and partly by her being indispensable. Of her success in this matter a Nonconformist minister writes:

'Committees are generally understood to be difficult at times to please and to work with, first, because composed of such different elements, and then because subject to such constant change. The Committee of the Cottage Hospital has been no exception to this general rule; rather in respect of the elements of which it has been formed, the difficulty has been intensified. The noble object has moved men of every shade of politics and every form of religious belief to the work, and there have been passages in its history not pleasant to remember, but not one of those in the remotest degree involved Sister Dora. On the contrary, her presence and counsel always brought light and peace, and lifted every question to a higher sphere. "Ask Sister Dora," it used to be said. "Had we not better send for Sister Dora?" some member would exclaim out of the fog of contention. Thereupon she would appear; and many will remember how calmly self-possessed, and clear-sighted, she would stand—never sit down (indeed, there are those who worked with her fifteen years who never saw her seated)—she would stand, usually with her hand on the back of the chair that had been placed for her, every eye directed to her, nor was it ever many moments before she had grasped the whole question, and given her opinion just as clearly and simply and straight to the purpose as any opinion given to the sufferers in the wards. Nor was she ever wrong, nor did she ever fail of her purpose with the committee. No committeeman ever questioned or differed from Sister Dora, yet in her was the sublime charm of unconsciousness of power or superiority, and the impression left was of there being no feeling of pleasure in her, other than the triumph of the right. And what is true of the committee, as a whole, is true of each individual thereof. There was a freedom, frankness, close straightforwardness in her bearing, such as many never experienced from any lady besides, so much so that a younger member, whose mind was full at the time of Greek poetry, said that the way she stood and looked you full in the face reminded him of a Greek goddess, such as Athene.'—*Sister Dora*, p. 252.

Much of her own private means was spent on the hospital; no one knew how much, nor did any of her friends know what her income was. It was her nature to be self-sufficing, to take little or no counsel with others, and to seek for scarcely any of that sympathy which she could boundlessly bestow. All the time there was a strong sense of the benefits of control; she sometimes wished to enter a stricter sisterhood

Digitized by Google

for the sake of the discipline, and often in her latter days said that marriage would have been better for her, as every woman ought to be in subjection to a man.

There could be no doubt, however, that Providence had set her in the place for which she was in every way best fitted. Skill in surgical treatment was above all others her forte, and she could deal as well as most medical men with the peculiarly frightful accidents to which iron-foundries are liable; while the strength, sweetness, and liveliness of her nature won her the hearts of the rough, independent people. Very soon after her first arrival, when the sight of the sisters was new and not acceptable, as she was passing in the street, a boy shouted, 'There goes one of those Sisters of Misery!' and threw a stone at her, which cut her forehead.' Not long after he was brought into the hospital after a severe injury, and experienced Sister Dora's tender care and attention. One night she found him quietly crying, and before long, he confessed, with many sobs, that he threw the stone. 'Oh!' she replied, 'did you think I did not know that? why I knew you the very minute you came in at the door.' 'What, you knew me and have been nursing me like this!' His astonishment was as great as that of an atheistical man who, after giving all the trouble he could, disturbing the reading of prayers, and trying to make the other patients mutinous, suddenly exclaimed one night, when the sister was striving patiently to relieve his suffering, 'I hope they pay you well for this.' 'Yes,' she replied, 'very well.' 'Come now, what do they give you, I really want to know.' 'Then,' said the sister, 'I thought I might as well tell him how I considered I was paid.' He listened attentively, and changed his whole demeanour from that time.

The habitual bad language of these rough men came to them irrepressibly in their times of suffering, and Sister Dora's manner of meeting it was like herself. To a man who declared he must make some outcry in his agony, she said, good-humouredly, 'Well, say poker and tongs,' and whenever she heard him muttering imprecations she would cheerfully call out 'Poker and tongs.' And when a poor, pretty little child of three years old, on having its bandages touched, broke out with such a storm of curses that the men around would have silenced it sharply, she turned on them with the question, 'Where had the poor baby learnt such words? and in whom were they worse—in it or in them?' Mrs. Aikenhead's sisters at Cork used to try to cure their seafaring friends of cursing by persuading them to take a pocketful

Digitized by Google

of pebbles out in the boat, and to throw one into the sea for every oath they uttered. That appreciation of fun and drollery as a great engine of management was to be found in both Sisters Dora and Mary Augustine, but the former, from her vigorous health and strength, had the higher spirits, and her playful fun never failed when it could cheer or give strength to those whom she served.

Her most terrible and heroic periods were in the six months she spent single-handed in the smallpox hospital, amid all its loathsome horrors, of which she said in one of her notes, 'I declare I taste it in my tea.' Yet from thence her merry messages to her old patients never failed, nor her serious ones either, and she always spoke of 'that dear epidemic hospital,' as if her time there had been one of shelter and rest. Two months after her return followed the frightful Burchells explosion, when eleven men were covered by a downpour of liquid molten metal, and in their first agony leapt into the canal close at hand. Their condition was such that the medical men could hardly stay in the ward, and the friends who volunteered help were almost instantly forced to retreat, sick and faint with horror, to the stairs. The ward was unusable afterwards: it seemed to have been absolutely poisoned, and the hospital finally had to be taken down and rebuilt. While these cases were in hand was the only time when Sister Dora found it necessary to fortify herself for the work with brandy. Two of the sufferers died in the course of the next night and day, but the rest lingered ten days, some longer, and only two ultimately recovered. Of these, only one had been in the water; the other had been at the top of the furnace, feeding it, and though terribly burnt, had escaped the molten metal. He described—

'Sister Dora going from bed to bed, talking, laughing, and even joking with the poor men, sitting by their bedsides, telling stories which she hoped might divert them for a moment from their misery, feeding them with her tenderest care, helping them to bear their pain, and pointing out the way to Heaven to those who were appointed to die.'

Every time this man mentioned the sister's name, he stood up and reverently pulled his forelock, as if she were a saint or an angel whom he was scarcely worthy to mention.

Certainly, the numbers who came under her hands at Walsall must have a recollection, unlike all else in their lives, of the tall, beautiful, dark-eyed lady moving from one to another, dressing wounds, arranging bandages, bringing relief

Digitized by Google

to many, cheerful or merry words to all, often with a poor little burnt or scalded child rolled in a blanket on her arm, which she hushed off to sleep with a magical, 'Come, come, don't cry; sister has you.' She had a magnetic influence over children, and there were large numbers constantly brought to her with burns or scalds. If possible, she sent them home to be nursed, and went daily to dress the wounds; but often she had to receive them into the hospital, and then she took them into her own immediate care, and has been known to sleep with a burnt baby on each arm in her own bed.

Her desire to lead her patients higher was intense. She said the thoughts haunted her of good words she might have said to them, but she said as many as they could bear; boldly, uncompromisingly, yet kindly, rebuked evil, and made her life one course of prayer and reading of the Scriptures at available moments.

A service was held every Sunday afternoon by a clergyman, in the open space at the top of the stairs, into which the three wards opened. After this she gave a discourse, sometimes a reproduction of what she had heard from Mr. Twigg, but oftener from her own soul, commenting on some passage in the Scripture, and bringing it to apply to the hearts and lives of her auditors. Old patients used to throng to hear her, and these Sunday afternoons were often openings of the doors of grace to them. Her face when reading the Bible in private was described by one of her pupils as unearthly in its expression. Many a sceptical mechanic came out of the hospital with an entirely new idea of Christianity.

Her physical strength was described by the doctors themselves as gigantic. She could pass several nights together without going to bed, and could carry helpless arrivals upstairs unassisted, pick up big colliers who had rolled out of bed, and put them back as if they were babies, and would even, unassisted, carry the corpses of full-grown men to the mortuary. At length, in the winter of 1876-7, she became sensible of symptoms which her medical attendant pronounced to be the sentence of death. An operation might yet have saved her, but she decided against it, enforced on him absolute secrecy, and went on with her labours as long as possible, in utter silence as to her own condition, toiling, indeed, harder than ever, so that the committee at times remonstrated with her, declaring that she would kill herself. It was the same strong solitary spirit as ever, unable to brook the pity or sympathy of others. She seemed, nay was, in as high spirits as ever, and when a long holiday was occasioned

Digitized by Google

by the removal to the newly-built hospital, she went first to the Isle of Man with her nieces, and frolicked in the sea with them like a mermaid, and then visited the Paris Exhibition for the sake of studying the surgical instruments there, and then was instructed in London in Professor Lister's treatment of wounds. By this time, however, the suffering had become terrible, and could no longer be concealed, and on the 8th of October she returned to Walsall, 'to die among her own people,' as she said, or, as she wrote to the clergyman whom she begged to visit her, 'to climb to Mount Calvary by the ladder of sickness.' The hospital was not ready, and she was taken to a small house, with at first only a maid servant to attend her.

It is hard to understand or justify her absolute determination to keep the nature of her malady a secret, and to debar her sisters and nieces from all attendance upon her. Two of her sisters came to Walsall, and remained near her for a week, visiting her, but found her resolved against accepting their services as nurses. There was an almost frantic desire to keep every one aloof who could guess at the state she was in, and they sorrowfully took leave of her. As she became more helpless, a lady who had undertaken to be her successor at the hospital arrived and devoted herself to the care of her. The lady had had far greater advantages in training as a skilled nurse than Sister Dora, who appreciated her care as much for her patients as for herself. There were peace, faith, hope, submission: but the agony was great, and there were often severe passages of mental depression, in the midst of the sure and certain hope sustained by prayers and communions, and through all shone the unquenchable spirit of drollery, such as always calling her swollen and useless arm, 'Sir Roger,' after 'the Claimant.' In December the end was fast coming. She said she hoped to sing her Christmas carol in Heaven, and it was on Christmas Eve, 1877, that the end came. Her old servant said, 'Our Blessed Lord is standing at the gates, to open them for you.' 'I see Him,' she answered, 'the gates are opened wide!' The faithful maid remembered a little burnt girl of nine years old, who had died saying, 'Sister, I'll meet you at the gate with a bunch of flowers in my hand,' and wondered if she, too, was greeting her.

When all had been done that could be done, she said, 'Let me die alone, as I have lived alone;' and they left her, only one friend watching through the half-open door. All was still, pain seemed over, and hours passed by, until at

Digitized by Google

2 p.m. a slight change of posture showed that the spirit had departed.

The simplest of all funerals was hers, by her own express desire; but it was thronged by such grateful, loving multitudes as to be so delayed that, by a strange coincidence with the whole spirit of her life, four workhouse coffins reached the cemetery at the same time, and the same burial service sufficed for all.

Few lives have been more noble. Few have had the opportunity of so using to the utmost remarkable gifts of all kinds. Sister Dora seems to us the greatest of the four women we have described, and for that reason, perhaps, the least equably perfect.

We leave her with the feeling that is produced by the 13th chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians, as if S. Paul's ideal had started up embodied in our own day, and we can only say, 'The greatest of these is charity.'

ART. VI.—THE SYSTEM OF LAND TENURE IN ANCIENT PALESTINE.

1. *Village Communities in the East and West.* By Sir HENRY SUMNER MAINE. (London, 1872.)
2. *De la Propriété et de ses Formes primitives.* Par EMILE DE LAVELEYE. (Paris, 1874.)
3. *De Godsdienst van Israel.* Van Dr. A. KUENEN. (Haarlem, 1869.)
4. *The Prophecies of Isaiah.* By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A. (London, 1880.)

ONE of the most general phenomena in primitive legal history is the assumption that the land occupied by a community is the property of the community as a whole; while, at the same time, the interests of individuals, or rather of families, in the land thus occupied are from the first recognized, and tend to approximate increasingly to a proprietary right. While the almost universal extent of this conception of land tenure has of late been sufficiently recognized, it may be doubted whether it has yet been traced in all the fulness of its consequences. As it is instructive to see how similar

Digitized by Google

was the primitive organization of 'village communities in the East and West,' so it is not unlikely that the contrast between the history and civilization of the East and West may be traced to the differences in the development of this common primitive element. In Europe, two or three, or five or seven,[1] village communities unite into a city, with a market in the midst, and 'the rule of the market,' allowing the free sale of lawful property for what it will fetch, comes to be regarded as a law of nature, so that at last the law of property either attains or aims at a state of things where 'land can be sold as easily as a watch.' In Asia, on the contrary, instead of village communities coalescing spontaneously with each other, we find them swallowed whole, so to speak, in the larger but more hollow unity of great national monarchies:[2] an ill-defined share of the proprietary rights of the commune is transferred to the central government, and thus we get the state of things commonly described by the phrase, 'the Sovereign is the universal landlord.' From the nature of the case he is a non-resident landlord, generally an arbitrary one, and the case is as likely to be worse as better, because the cultivators of the soil are not his immediate tenants, but have over them a middleman in the shape of the commune, now perhaps incarnate in the person of an hereditary headman.

Now it is remarkable that the only Oriental nation whose influence has transformed the history of Europe, the only one in whose history the general European mind is interested, itself emerges into history from the country where the Oriental theory of the Sovereign's proprietorship of the soil was most strictly and consistently enforced. It is not necessary, as it is for the present hopeless, to discuss how the system of State proprietorship attained such development in Egypt. Both the Hebrew and the Greek annals[3] conceive it not to have been immemorial, but the product of a revolution. It is not impossible that the oldest Egyptian monuments describe a state of things prior to that revolution: but if so, they seem to show that the revolution was less extensive than

[1] As probably at Athens, certainly at Sparta and Rome. See Maine's *Village Communities*, Lect. vi. p. 192.

[2] The writer had an interview with Mr. George Smith, just before his last journey to the East, when he told him that in Assyria he found no trace of the soil being regarded as royal property, *because* the Assyrian monarchy arose by the coalescing, not the swallowing up, of homogeneous civic communities. Thus the social state of Assyria is an exception that proves the rule.

[3] Gen. xlvii.; Hdt. II. 109; Diod. I. 54.

Digitized by Google

it is generally conceived to have been; perhaps, also, that it was more justifiable. The superficial reading of Gen. xlvii. would suggest the view that Joseph expropriated and enslaved a free peasantry; that, in other words, he saved Egypt for seven years, at the cost of ruining it for four thousand. But his policy bears a very different character, if we conceive it as the redemption and simplification of various seignorial rights, such as may have been well worth commuting for a fixed tax of one-fifth of the produce to the central government.

It seems implied in both the native and the Hebrew accounts, as indeed it is *à priori* probable, that some local unity and organization existed before the centralization, and was superseded by it. The nomarchs before Joseph's time may have come nearer than afterwards to the character of a feudal nobility; but at any rate the Egyptians of Joseph's time consider themselves as already *adscripti glebæ*. It does not occur to them to sell their lands as a less sacrifice than the selling their bodies. And as soon as they and their land are bought, Joseph thinks it necessary to separate the two: 'as for the people, he removed them to cities, from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof;' it being his object, we may suppose, to destroy all associations recalling the old local rights and organizations.

Now the law of Moses has at least this in common with Egyptian history as known to us, that the rights of the Sovereign are far more carefully asserted, and are far more fundamental to the national life, than those of any local unit less extensive than the nation. The King of Israel, not the individual Israelite, nor yet any tribe or family in Israel, is the true owner of the soil of Canaan; 'the land shall not be sold indefeasibly, for the land is Mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with Me.' So far, we have the Egyptian system, with one important difference; the substitution of a divine for a human sovereign. The priesthood, who in Egypt were independent of the King, were in Israel to be his only visible representatives: nor was there a military aristocracy to be maintained at the cost of the nation, co-ordinately with the Court and the priesthood. 'The Five Alls' are reduced to two: those who 'pray for all' 'rule all' and 'plead for all,' and those who 'pray for all' are trusted themselves to 'fight for all,' with their sacerdotal chiefs and judges at their head. Thus we are not surprised to find that the rent or land-tax paid to the Sovereign in Israel was but half as much as in Egypt, and the payment of it was apparently so slight a

Digitized by Google

burden that its religious and festal accompaniments made it actually popular[1] (Amos iv. 4).

But while the law of Moses does not explicitly provide for an authority intermediate between the Divine Sovereign and the individual occupier, there are indications that such an intermediate authority existed, and was meant to be recognized in the application of the law. Although the Israelites might be said to have first become a nation at the Exodus, yet they had existed before, and had customs of their own; and Moses did not, any more than any other lawgiver, legislate *in vacuo*, for a people to whom one law would be as intelligible and as practicable as another. Before we inquire further into the Mosaic laws of land tenure, it will be best to consider what customs in relation thereto the Israelites had been or would be familiar with.

Now, in the first instance we have of a Hebrew becoming possessed of landed property at all, we are told in the minutest detail on what terms and by what means he was possessed of it. We see that Abraham, in applying for the purchase of the Field of Machpelah, addresses himself, not to Ephron the 'proprietor' (as we should call him) of the field, but to the community to which he belonged, the children of Heth. He introduces his application with the confession, 'I am a stranger and a sojourner with you'—not a member of the Hittite *populus*, who would have a claim of right to a share in their *ager publicus;* but he wants to be admitted to a share in such property, on such terms as 'a stranger and a sojourner' may. 'Give me a possession of a burying-place' (אֲחֻזַּת־קֶבֶר, Hieron. *jus sepulcri*) 'with you.' The people offer to him, readily and in courteous terms, not the possession, but the use, of any burying-place belonging to any of the community; but Abraham is not satisfied with such a personal

[1] The tithes were to be paid at the end of three years (Deut. xiv. 28, xxvi. 12): presumably, because the fields were customarily cultivated in a three years' course of crops, so that the fairest system of tithing was to strike an average of the three, while a year's fallow was enforced after every other rotation. It is generally inferred from Deut. xv. 18, and one or two other passages, that three years was the ordinary term of engagement for a hired labourer, which becomes intelligible, if that was the period both of the farmer's need of work and of his means of payment. The view here taken of the law of tithing, it must be confessed, is not the traditional one, but it is admitted in the Talmud that the one finally adopted did not rest on a *continuous* tradition. It is already suggested by Laveleye (*Property and its Primitive Forms*, c. ii. p. 13) that the Sabbatical Year is to be compared with the septennial period observed elsewhere for the re-division of lands. Are we to understand from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21 that the Sabbatical Year had been unobserved *only* for 490 years before the Captivity—*i.e.* exactly during the regal period?

Digitized by Google

and temporary concession: he wants it more for his heirs than for himself. With all deference to the sovereign assembly which he is addressing, he says, 'If it be your mind that I should bury my dead out of my sight, hear me, and intreat for me to Ephron the son of Zohar' (note that Ephron is designated by his patronymic: he is *patricius*, *hid'algo*) 'that he may give me the Cave of Machpelah, which belongeth to him (אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ) which is in the end of his field (שָׂדֵהוּ); *for full money*[1] he shall give it me for a possession of a burying-place among you.' The narrative proceeds, 'And Ephron was sitting' (as a member of the assembly; he was present, but Abraham would have been 'out of order' in addressing him directly and individually) 'in the midst of the children of Heth: and Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham in the audience of the children of Heth, even of all that went in at the gate of his city' (this is insisted on, to show that the bargain was made with all publicity, but for which it would have been informal, perhaps invalid), 'saying, "Nay, my lord, hear me; the field give I thee, and the cave that is therein, I give it thee: in the presence of the sons of my people give I it thee: bury thy dead."' This offer is usually supposed to be an insincere one, made to prevent Abraham from objecting to the high price afterwards asked; but this seems inconsistent, not only with the frank and friendly relations implied in the whole story between Abraham and his neighbours, but especially with the formula 'in the presence of the sons of my people,' which surely constitutes the offer, had it been accepted, a *bonâ fide* conveyance of the land. But, however sincere, Abraham declines the offer: he will accept no favour; on the one hand, he will not become a Hittite by adoption, but on the other hand he will have an indisputably legal title to the soil which the Hittites own now. Again he salutes the assembly, though now, having their sanction, he is at liberty to address himself directly to Ephron, and settle the terms of the bargain with him; still speaking, however, 'in the audience of the people of the land: "But if thou be for it, hear me: I will give the money-price of the field (כֶּסֶף הַשָּׂדֶה); take it of me, and I will bury my dead there." And Ephron answered Abraham, saying unto him, "My lord, hearken unto me; the land is for 400 shekels of silver."'

[1] Compare the *Senchus Mor.* ap. Maine, *V.C.* Lect. vi. p. 187, on the distinction between 'rack-rent, from a person of a strange tribe,' and 'a fair rent, paid by one of the tribe:' Abraham offers the former, for, as Sir H. Maine observes, the rules of price are essentially the same as those of rent.

Digitized by Google

We do not know, but Ephron and Abraham did, what was the extent of the land in question, and what the purchasing power of a shekel; we cannot tell, therefore, whether the price was exorbitant, but it was doubtless high. But Abraham had gained his object: he was told the terms on which the land could be sold to a non-citizen: '*istud est pretium* inter me et te: *sed quantum est hoc? sepeli mortuum tuum.*' On these terms the bargain was formally concluded and, in all probability, formally recorded, as we read in Gen. xxiii. 16–18.

The word *śadeh*, which we have found here applied to a piece of ground, enclosed (by boundaries at least, if not fences), perhaps cultivated, and certainly planted with trees, is used also in a wider sense. In Gen. xxiv. 63 it is implied that it was a place for retirement; in xxvii. 3 we find it traversed by wild animals (probably, it is true, not larger than goats); and, still more, we meet not only with the constant phrase 'beast of the *śadeh*,' but in Gen. xxv. 27 we have the similar phrase 'a man of the *śadeh*,' synonymous with 'a man cunning in hunting,' and opposed to 'a simple man dwelling in tents.' Again, looking back to Gen. xiv. 7, we find 'the *śadeh* of the Amalekites' spoken of in the same sense as *ager* is constantly used in Latin, of their national territory; perhaps the proper name '*Śiddim*' in the same passage, the plural of a cognate form of the noun, arises from its being the united lands of a federation. And passing on to a later generation, we find the *śadeh* represented as an extensive whole, but a *divisible* one. As Abraham had bought a field in the neighbourhood of Mamre, so did Jacob buy one at Shalem, a city of Shechem; and, like Abraham, he is said to buy it, not of the individual Shechemite owner, but 'of the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem.' But we observe that Jacob does not buy a *śadeh* as a whole, *eo nomine*, but אֶת־חֶלְקַת הַשָּׂדֶה, LXX. *τὴν μερίδα τοῦ ἀγροῦ*, 'the *allotment of the field* where he had spread his tent.' This phrase *chelkath haś-śadeh*, 'allotment of the field,' seems to be an even more significant, because more distinctly technical, term than the simple *śadeh* itself; while it suggests what the meaning of the latter was, so far as it was technically definable: the *śadeh* is the land belonging to a community, and includes both the common waste, available for hunting-ground or pasture, and the cultivable soil, which latter was appropriated in 'allotments' to individuals or families among the citizens.[1]

[1] See Mr. W. L. Bevan's article, 'Field,' in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.* He seems to have needed nothing but the analogies which have

Digitized by Google

A non-citizen, as we saw in Abraham's case, could only acquire such an allotment by the sanction of the whole community in their primary assembly, as well as by purchase, at the highest price asked, from the citizen allottee, if there was one; possibly we are to understand that Jacob's allotment was one that had not yet been assigned to any citizen, but that he was required to pay a price to the community of Shechem for the privilege which the men of Mamre had freely granted to Abraham.

There is clearly a gap somewhere in the history of Jacob's 'allotment of the field' at Shechem; but, even in its fragmentary state, it shows manifest analogues to phenomena familiar further west. Jacob's sons, as might be expected, feed their cattle in the *śadeh:* his own *chelkah* being, apparently, not in cultivation, but occupied by the tents of his numerous household. As a non-citizen he could, perhaps, have gained no title to a house within the city walls, except by becoming a client to a Hivite citizen; as a mere squatter on the *śadeh*, he might have been expropriated at discretion; as it is, he has at a high cost acquired a *status* of his own, not very different from that of a *Pfahlbürger* or plebeian. But, unlike the Roman plebeians, he is not a man without a nationality, and is not, therefore, a mere dependent on the nation with whom he sojourns. The Hebrew household negotiates, on terms of equality, with the chiefs of the *populus* of Shechem. The latter propose (Gen. xxxiv. 9, 10) a treaty of incorporation between the two communities, with *jus conubii et commercii:* the gain from such a treaty being represented to be, to the House of Israel the acquisition of heritable landed property for cultivation, to the House of Hamor the acquisition of the abundant live stock of the proposed new citizens (*ib.* vv. 20-23); and we notice that this last is put forward as an attraction to the citizen assembly rather than to the chief, who has another private motive of his own.

The treaty is apparently concluded, but immediately violated; and the sequence of events after its violation is beyond our power to trace (compare Gen. xxxv. 5 with xxxvii. 12 *sqq.*, xlviii. 22). This however we see, that the Patriarchs had, and bequeathed to their descendants, claims to portions of the soil of Canaan that were valid according to Canaanite law and custom; and the careful record of Abraham's purchase of Machpelah, and of Jacob's bequest of Shechem to Joseph, seem

been pointed out since to have anticipated the suggestions of the present paper.

Digitized by Google

to prove, either that the memory of the rights of their fathers was never lost among the Israelites, or that Moses was studious to revive it; whence it is at least possible, that the conceptions of landed property with which he had to deal should be as much based on the laws and customs of Canaan as on those of Egypt. It will not be very surprising if we find that the Egyptian element is the stronger in the earlier legislation, within a year or two of the Exodus, while Canaanite customs are more prominently referred to in the Deuteronomy, when the conquest of the Amorite settlements had begun. We have seen already how, in the Book of Leviticus, we met with the Egyptian theory of crown-ownership modified and sublimated: 'The land is Mine, and ye are strangers and sojourners with Me.' The practical law, which this theory is alleged to enforce, is that the individual occupant of land has only a life-interest in it, and cannot therefore alienate the absolute ownership of the soil, because he does not himself possess it. But it is abstractedly equitable, and economically advantageous, that he *should* have the right to sell this life-interest; and an arrangement is therefore made for him to do this, or something equivalent to this, on the terms most equitable for both parties. He was enabled to sell the land for a term of years, not exceeding the interval from twenty, when he came of age for military and probably for legal purposes, to seventy, the estimated end of a normal human life. Only the law fixed the date of expiry of a bargain, instead of leaving it to be determined by the chances of the seller's vitality, which might be above or below the average. Neither buyer nor seller could know for certain how long the latter could live, nor did actuaries' tables exist that would show even how long he was likely to live; but both parties knew how long it was to the next Jubilee, and therefore could calculate what was the fair price of the usufruct transferred from one to the other.[1] (*See* Lev. xxv. 15–17; where it is plain that this portion of the law is for the enforcement, not of an ideal of brotherly charity, as is the case with some especially of the Deuteronomic legislation, but of common-sense business-like equity.)

But while the land-law of the Pentateuch thus insists on the supreme rights in the soil of the Divine Sovereign of the nation, it says nothing of the rights of any community of less extent than the nation. We meet with the word *śadeh* not very infrequently (Exodus xxii. 5, 6; Lev. xix. 19, xxv. 3, &c.),

[1] This significance of the law of the Jubilee is pointed out in Mr. Fenton's article on *Primitive Hebrew Land Tenure* in the *Theological Review* for October 1877.

Digitized by Google

but we never find direct reference to the *chelkath haś-śadeh*, which we found to be a Canaanite institution in Jacob's time. In Lev. xxv., the property the integrity of which is so carefully secured is throughout called אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' not חֶלְקָה, 'allotment.' Yet the former more general term might be fairly considered as including the latter as a special case: if we find historical evidence of the existence in Israel of the communal form of land-tenure, which is the earliest found in most known countries, we need not suppose that this existed only in violation or in ignorance of the law, though the law does not explicitly recognize it: it is possible that the law was, even designedly, so worded as to cover the customs that naturally prevail both in a primitive and in a more highly developed society.

We meet with a series of passages, all through the Old Testament, and commencing in the Book of Deuteronomy, which are most intelligible if we suppose the cultivated lands to be, in certain cases, subject to re-allotment; viz., those that speak of the *removing of landmarks*. By itself, indeed, the use of moveable landmarks instead of fences does not prove much; it survived among the independent and readily transferable properties of Assyria, where inscriptions on the landmarks served as the title-deeds to the estate; and so long as such landmarks were in use, the curse of Deut. xxvii. 17 would be intelligible, as directed against a serious but not very difficult form of fraud. But in Deut. xix. 14 it seems as though the act protested against was not a fraud, but only an innovation: 'Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark;' not merely because it *is* thy neighbour's and thou robbest him in removing it, but because it is what '*they of old time* have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it.' It here seems as though the Israelites were actually charged to respect the existing subdivisions of the Canaanite territory, and adopt them as the bases of the division of it among themselves; and, strange as such a precept is to our *primâ facie* conceptions of the character of the Israelite conquest, it is by no means unlikely that it may have been salutary. The various portions of the conquered land were, we know, to be assigned by lot; but the unit of distribution might be taken as given by precedent custom, much more fairly and conveniently than if it had been determined by any artificial and therefore arbitrary test.

Still it is possible, no doubt, to understand this text of Deuteronomy, not as a call to respect immemorial custom

Digitized by Google

even of Canaanite origin, but as a command to respect Israelite custom at the remote date when that too should have become immemorial. But elsewhere we find the removal of landmarks represented, not (as we might expect) as an act of fraud, so much as of high-handed and perhaps legalized oppression. So it certainly is in the Book of Job, which, whatever the date or place of its origin, may fairly be assumed to represent the social state and customs of the Hebrew race in their most primitive form. In Job xxiv. 2 *sqq.* we read: 'They remove the landmarks: they violently take away flocks, and feed them. They drive away the ass of the fatherless: they take the widow's ox *for a pledge*. They turn the needy out of the way: the poor of the land hide themselves together.' The dispossessed peasants have the alternative of a savage nomad life, or of working on the land that was once their own; whether as slaves, hirelings, or pauper gleaners, is not quite clear. 'Behold, as wild asses in the desert go they forth to their work; rising betimes for a prey: the wilderness is unto them food for their children. They reap his' (their oppressor's) '*fodder in the field*' (the *śadeh* is still cultivated, but, if the word בָּלִיל has its usual sense, for the benefit of beasts, not men; as conversely in Isaiah xxx. 24, the abundance promised to men is made to extend to beasts): 'and they gather the harvest of the wicked man's vineyard. . . . They pluck the fatherless from the breast: and take a pledge of the poor.'

It is not difficult to recognize in this picture the common plague of ancient agricultural societies. The man with capital (in live stock or otherwise) establishes a lien upon the estate of his neighbour with none. During the poor debtor's lifetime, he perhaps receives interest on the loan which makes it worth the creditor's while to tolerate his existence; but on his dying without repayment of the principal, his heirs are, not expropriated, but appropriated, with their land and cattle: the divisions of their land from the capitalist's being obliterated, as they disappear in his slave-family and their cattle in his herds.

It is generally recognized that the Mosaic law is full of provisions to hinder or mitigate this process, for which the common law of antiquity gave such fatal facility. It is worth observing how these provisions are related to the land laws which we have remarked upon already. Moses, like Solon,[1] feels it to be a duty of religion, as well as patriotism, to

[1] *Fr.* 25, *al.* 36.

Digitized by Google

assert the liberty of the Lord's land and of the Lord's people at once. Israel, it is expected, will not be so absolutely fixed to the soil as the Egyptians were in Joseph's time; the three stages of the decline and fall of the free peasant were, for the capitalist to take his land in security for a debt, to take unlimited usury on the debt, and at last to take the debtor himself as a slave for non-payment; and thus we see why the prohibition of usury in Lev. xxv. 35–8 is inserted *between* the provisions for the redemption or release of lands and of persons respectively.

In Prov. xxiii. 10 *sq.*, it is possible that we have the same case as in the passage above cited from the Book of Job: 'Remove not the old landmark: and enter not into the fields of the fatherless. For their Redeemer' (or 'Guardian'—the next kinsman to those who have no other kin) 'is mighty: He shall plead their cause with thee.' But perhaps here we have to do, not with the rich man 'that oppresseth the poor to increase his riches,' but with the less heinous crime of the 'poor man that oppresseth the poor'—the equals and neighbours, whose hard dealing has the excuse that their own life is not easy. In this passage, and still more in xxii. 28, it is 'the *ancient* landmark, which *thy fathers* have set' that commands reverence; it seems as though the evil complained of were not so much an inexcusable aggression on private property as an unsettling of customary relations, rather impolitic and inequitable than openly unjust. The question, in fact, is that between Kentish and Irish Gavelkind—the same which among the Franks was decided by a law of Chilperic[1] in A.D. 561—whether a man's land shall be inherited by his children or by his neighbours. Israelite law, like Teutonic, answered decisively, 'By his children;' and if he left a son or son-in-law, or perhaps a nephew, competent to take the late owner's place among the citizens, the law will take its course, and the heir will peaceably succeed to the property. But if the only heirs are young children, unable to provide for the due cultivation of their lot of land, how is it to be secured to them? Nay, ought it to be secured to them at all? Is not the maximum productiveness of the soil belonging to the whole community, in maintaining which the whole community is interested, best maintained if the vacant piece be annexed to or divided among the adjoining ones? The argument is at least plausible, but the higher morality of Solomon overrules it; he asserts that there

[1] Quoted by Laveleye, *Property and its Primitive Forms*, c. v. p. 77.

Digitized by Google

is One who will assert the rights of the helpless children thus sacrificed to collective selfishness, and that in the end it will prove to have been the best policy to respect them: 'The Lord will destroy the house of the proud: but He will establish the landmark of the widow' (Prov. xv. 25). But, in other countries, where religion and law allied themselves less closely with the highest moral feelings, the sense of compassion for the orphan, though not unfelt, was commonly overruled:—

> αἰεί τοι τούτῳ γε πόνος καὶ κήδε' ὀπίσσω
> ἔσσοντ' · ἄλλοι γάρ οἱ ἀπουρίσσουσιν ἀρούρας.[1]

Yet, so far, we have not seen, either in the precepts of Moses and Solomon, or even in the evils that they protest against, any direct sanction given to a communal system of land-ownership, or direct statement of its existence. But if we consider the social organization of the Israelites at the time of their conquest of Canaan, it will seem almost necessary, *à priori*, that they should have adopted that system; nor is evidence wanting in later times to verify the conclusion that they did.

As Moses recognizes a sacred principle in the life and unity of the Israelite nation as a whole, so he likewise consecrates two smaller units, the Tribe and the Household, within the bounds of the holy Nation itself. The former is the basis of the whole political organization, and is deeply involved in the religious; the latter is the security for the permanence of religious tradition, and its own permanence is sought to be preserved, by the laws of inheritance already adverted to and otherwise, as indeed is done in all nations and religions. Moses does not ascribe equal importance to any organism intermediate in scale between these two: but we find such an intermediate body mentioned and utilized in the Law (Num. i.), and assuming greater prominence in the Book of Joshua (vii. 17), the מִשְׁפָּחָה, Luth. *Geschlecht*—the exact equivalent, as Niebuhr observed, of the Latin *Gens*. Like *gens*, this word *mishpachah* is also used in a wider sense; but in this definite and technical sense it seems to be equivalent to a phrase more frequently recurring—the 'father's house.' Now, when this body, the 'family' or 'father's house,' held the important place it obviously did in the social or civic organism, it is natural that it should have its economic function too; we might ex-

[1] *Il.* xxii. 488–9. In view of this analogy, we are perhaps justified in recurring to the obvious spelling and etymology of ἀπουρίσσουσιν, instead of that usually received since Buttmann.

Digitized by Google

pect *à priori* that as each tribe had a certain portion allotted to it in the conquered territory, so in that province each family of the tribe would have a district allotted to itself. And this seems to afford us a clue to a principle to be traced in several passages of the Book of Joshua. In xv. 12, we hear of 'the inheritance of the tribe of the children of Judah *according to their families;*' in xvii. 1–5, we find in more detail the number of allotments in the territory of Manasseh regulated by the number of the eponymi of families, the five spirited daughters of Zelophehad being included in the number.

And as it is with the first beginning of the history of Israel in Canaan, so it is with the few and fragmentary hints we possess of their internal history thenceforward. Few and fragmentary we may call them; for the Prophetical Books of Judges and Kings, as a rule, concern themselves only with the fortunes of the nation as a whole, with the varying periods of religious declension and reformation, and of general prosperity and foreign subjection or humiliation. Only five times in the Book of Judges is there exhibited to us an Israelite domestic 'interior:' in the two stories with which the Book concludes, and in the accounts of the life, before their greatness, of Gideon and Jephthah, and perhaps of Samson. Indications of the social life of this period, more numerous though even more fragmentary, are furnished by the genealogical and other notices in the earlier chapters of the Books of Chronicles. Here we meet with numerous confusions and corruptions of the text, earlier, in all probability, than the redaction of the Book itself in its present form; but, without attempting the discussion of these, either with a critical or an apologetic purpose, we may assume two points as clear: first, that in some of the genealogies geographical names appear intermixed with personal ones; and, secondly, that this fact does not justify the conclusion which it cannot fail to suggest, that the genealogies are mythical forms of the statement of relations which had originally a local rather than an ethnic basis. For instance, in 1 Chron. ii. 19, Ephrath, the wife of Caleb, and in vii. 17, Maachah, the wife of Machir, look certainly like imaginary eponymi of towns in Judah and in Gilead, though nothing but deliberate fiction would account for the circumstantial story of the second marriage of Caleb to Machir's daughter. But when we find that Joab (*ib.* iv. 14) is the 'father of the Valley of Craftsmen,' and that 'the sons of Salma' (*ib.* ii. 54) include the *towns* of Bethlehem and Ataroth, the *families* of the Netophathites and Zorites, 'the House of Joab, and *half* of the Manahethites,' we see that the question is not whether the

Digitized by Google

Chronicler was writing authentic history or not, but whether he was writing transparent nonsense or not. If not, he must have had a meaning in setting *places* in a genealogy as co-ordinate with *persons* and families; *i.e.*, there must have existed local associations co-ordinate with genealogical ones, and indeed (as analogy will lead us to believe) themselves resting, or conventionally assumed to rest, on a genealogical basis. In fact, we may infer that each 'family,' 'father's house,' or 'thousand,'[1] existing at the time of the Conquest, settled in one or more communes; so that, as the settlement became complete, the family and the commune became co-extensive, and it was a chance whether the local or the hereditary name prevailed.

Toward the close of the period of the Judges, we do find a narrative, neither scanty nor fragmentary, of the history, for four generations, of an Israelite family; and here, if there be any truth in the theory here propounded, we ought to expect to find verifications of it. But before examining whether we do find them, we may observe that the theory enables us to escape the difficulties which beset the origin of that family. The chief hindrance to the reconstruction of biblical chronology is the shortness of the genealogy of David, especially of that portion of it expressed in S. Matthew's statement that 'Salmon begat Booz of Rachab.' But if the Śalma of 1 Chron. ii. 11 (who is certainly S. Matthew's Salmon) be the same person as the Śalma of vv. 51, 54, we may plausibly suppose that the latter passage gives his actual parentage or descent,[2] but that he was 'the son of Nahshon,' in the sense that Jehu is called by Shalmanubar 'the son of Omri.' Nahshon was Prince of Judah (Num. i. 7, &c.) immediately after the Exodus, and no doubt died in the Wilderness: his successor may well have been the husband of Rahab, and 'the father of Bethlehem' in the sense above suggested. And Boaz the Bethlehemite may have been called the son of Salma

[1] The 'father's house' and the 'thousand' seem to be identical in Joshua xxii. 14, 30; Judges vi. 15; and similarly the 'thousand' and 'family' are identified in 1 Sam. x. 19, 21. Comparing Judges vi. 15 with viii. 2, we should gather that Abiezer was Gideon's 'thousand' or 'father's house,' whether this was co-extensive with 'Ophrah of the Abiezrites,' or included the people of other cities also. In Micah v. 2 it seems that the single town of Bethlehem constituted a 'thousand,' though a small one; but from 1 Sam. xvii. 18 we should imagine not.

[2] This has a certain interest to the Christian. If we accept the plausible tradition or conjecture of Josephus, that Hur's wife (who is not named in the Chronicles) was Miriam, the latter would thus be an ancestress of Boaz, and so of her namesake.

Digitized by Google

or Salmon, not only in the same sense that any of his neighbours might be. We get instances, especially on the eastern and southern frontiers, of what seem to be *titles* of hereditary or territorial chieftaincy; and perhaps Boaz *was* Bethlehem, in the sense that Jephthah's father (Judges xi. 1, 2) was Gilead, or Pekah's victim (2 Kings xv. 25) Argob, in the same sense, in fact, in which Evan Cameron was Locheill; while he was the son of Salmon in the same sense as the Duke of Argyll is MacCallum More.[1]

But whatever Boaz' rank or pedigree, the Book of Ruth gives us a complete picture of agricultural society in his time. Elimelech and his family migrated to Moab, and 'squat' upon the *śadeh*. Whether their being allowed to do so implies a connexion between Moab and Bethlehem already existing is doubtful: we have seen land more permanently occupied by Abraham and Jacob while still remaining 'strangers and sojourners;' and in Judges xix. 16 we find an Ephraimite sojourner allowed to work on the *śadeh* of Gibeah of Benjamin. A stronger evidence is the marriage of Elimelech's sons with native women: the *jus conubii* perhaps implying a *jus commercii*, as in the case already referred to of Jacob and Shechem. But whatever rights a stranger could claim, even in a foreign but allied community, their enjoyment was dependent on there being an efficient claimant: the two widows, on their return even to their own city, find themselves landless there. Elimelech's landmark has apparently been removed, on the supposed extinction of his family, or at all events his lot is not made over to his widow; and Ruth goes to glean 'after him in whose sight I shall find grace,' not knowing (did Naomi know?) that she might claim the privilege of gleaning as a legal right. 'And she went, and came, and gleaned in the field (*śadeh*) after the reapers: and her hap was to light upon an *allotment of the field* (*chelkath haśśadeh*) which belonged unto Boaz' (the phrase 'לְ אֲשֶׁר' is too common to build an argument on, still we may notice that it is the same as we had in Gen. xxiii. 9), 'who was of the kindred of Elimelech.' Boaz, we have already seen some grounds to suppose, was the hereditary chief of the town or clan; certainly he was 'a mighty man of valour,' and of rank and substance too: we find him here, not cultivating his lot as any other Bethlehemite might do, by the labour of himself,

[1] Why are five of Solomon's twelve 'officers' (1 Kings iv. 8–13) designated only by patronymics without personal names? Did the compiler of our Book of Kings use a mutilated list? or were these patronymics really titles by which they were habitually known?

Digitized by Google

his sons, and his slaves, but employing free Israelite reapers under a free overseer: whether hirelings or *métayers*[1] we cannot tell, but certainly the relation between him and them is proverbially frank and kindly. Is it a rash conjecture that Boaz is head-man in a commune, in the way to become lord of the manor, with seignorial rights to the commoners' service?—that he has a claim on his neighbours to get in the corn on his *τέμενος*, while yet he is so far one of themselves, that his land, on which they labour for him, is reckoned as an 'allotment,' like theirs, which they cultivate each for himself?

Whatever the terms of Boaz' relations with his workpeople, his friendliness with them seems to be nothing exceptional: it is rather the fruit of a healthy social state than of his individual nobility of character. For Nabal gets on with his people almost as well; his 'churlishness' is, at worst, an *égoïsme à plusieurs*, not inconsistent with a charity that begins at home; what he grudges to David is 'my bread and my water, and my flesh which I have killed *for my shearers*.' He seems, like Boaz, to have been a patriarchal chief, 'of the House of Caleb;' a house apparently occupying a district in 'the South,' where, as in the East, the settled communities shade off into the nomadic,[2] and so the names of clans survive co-ordinately with names of cities.

Boaz charges Ruth not to glean in any other *śadeh* but his (we notice here that what has been accurately described as *chelkath haś-śadeh* is now loosely called a *śadeh*, like the Field of Machpelah), and so matters go on through the harvest, during which time, probably, no public business could be done, certainly none involving the transfer of land, which still bore the crop sown by the actual occupier. Naomi, therefore, has taken no steps meanwhile to assert her own rights or Ruth's

[1] That *métayer* labour was familiar to the Jews in the last age of their independence seems to be implied in the parable of S. Mark xii. 1–9. This Gospel seems to give the story in a more original form than the parallel versions in SS. Matthew and Luke; we may surmise that S. Luke and the redactor of our Greek S. Matthew did *not* expect the form of tenure to be equally familiar to their readers. Hence *ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ* in v. 2 of S. Mark disappears in S. Matthew, and in v. 7 *ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία* is modified in both. In 1 Cor. ix. 7–10, 1 Tim. v. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 6, we may have references to a similar custom, or perhaps rather to the practice (approved in the Talmud, but not in harmony with S. Matt. xii. 1 *sqq.*, Jos. *Ant.*, IV. viii. 21) of allowing the benefits of Deut. xxiii. 24–5 only to the workmen employed on the ground.

[2] Compare David's fictitious expedition 'against the South of Judah, and against the South of the Jerahmeelites, and against the South of the Kenites (LXX. Kenizzites)' with the Amalekites' real one 'against the South of Caleb' (1 Sam. xxvii. 10; xxx. 14).

Digitized by Google

to her husband's *chelkah*: neither has Boaz, though it is implied (iii. 12) that he has thought of the matter, even before Ruth appeals to him.

When the appeal is made, the steps taken are described as fully and as vividly as the purchase of the Field of Machpelah; we may add, that they are almost as closely in accordance with the customs of other countries. Possibly we are to understand that Boaz, as chief of the city, has authority to convoke its assembly; at any rate, we observe that the assembly consists of two estates (if we may use the word), 'the inhabitants' (or 'people in session'?) 'and the elders of my people,' 'all the people that were in the gate, and the elders' (iv. 4, 11). And Boaz' first care is to secure a *quorum* of the elders: possibly a bare *quorum*, because the harvest operations are scarcely ended, and the assembly still thin, but more probably the number required (as at Rome) by custom for 'private business' such as his. As soon as they are seated—this, as in the case of Ephron, is especially noticed—he introduces the business: 'Naomi, that is come again out of the Field of Moab, selleth the allotment of the field which belonged to our brother Elimelech; and I thought' (he says to the *goel*) 'to advertise thee, saying, "Buy it"' (as Abraham did and as it was necessary to do now) '"before the inhabitants"' (? people in session), '"and before the elders of my people." If thou wilt redeem it, redeem it; but if thou wilt not redeem it, tell me, that I may know: for there is none to redeem it beside thee, and I am after thee'—*i.e.*, probably, 'you and I are the only kinsmen left.' The kinsman readily answers, 'I will redeem it.' 'Then said Boaz, "What day thou buyest the field (*śadeh*) of the hand of Naomi, thou must buy it also of Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the dead, to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance." And the kinsman said, "I cannot redeem it for myself, lest I mar mine own inheritance."' It is not quite clear what was his motive for thus changing his mind; Boaz had not said, though he had suggested, that the recognition of Ruth's interest in the land would naturally involve marriage with her; at any rate, Josephus' theory (*Ant.* V. ix. 4), that he was married and had children seems out of harmony with the spirit of the story. If his objection was to marriage with Ruth, it may be that he 'perceived that the seed would not be his;' that he feared that, if he had a child by Ruth, he would be reckoned as the son of Mahlon, and that his own name might disappear from the genealogy of Judah, as in later times did that of Pedaiah, who seems to have been the actual father of the

Digitized by Google

Prince Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel.[1] Possibly, however, the danger was to his 'inheritance' in a more material way: that his actual property was not equal to the purchase of another lot, in addition to his own, at its full value as determined by custom. He had been willing indeed to undertake the redemption of the life-interest of the aged Naomi, who, having no means of cultivating her land, was forced to sell it for what she could get. But it was another thing to buy the property of a young and marriageable woman; it was evident that Boaz would see that her rights were secured, perhaps also it was discernible that he was willing to have them devolved upon him. At any rate, whether in the interest of his family pride, of his property, or even in Boaz' own, the next kinsman withdrew his claim. 'Redeem thou my right to thyself; for I cannot redeem it; . . . buy it for thee.' So (according to the custom, which, even when the book was written, was a matter of antiquarian curiosity; but the other formalities were *not*), 'he drew off his shoe. And Boaz said unto *the elders*, and unto *all the people*, "Ye are witnesses this day, that I have bought all that belonged to Elimelech, and all that belonged to Chilion and Mahlon, of the hand of Naomi. Moreover, Ruth the Moabitess"' (as a foreigner, she is *not* designated by a patronymic, but by the one title that gives her a legal *status* in Israel), '"the wife of Mahlon, have I bought[2] to be my wife, to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance, that the name of the dead be not cut off *from among his brethren*, and *from the gate of his place*: ye are witnesses this day." And all the people that were in the gate, and the elders, said, "We are witnesses,"' and burst out into an almost poetical blessing on the marriage which was to avert the threatened extinction of the house of Pharez, to which their beloved chief belonged.

In the Books of Samuel we find very frequent mention of the *chelkah*, now used by itself instead of the full phrase *chelkath haś-śadeh*; we find, moreover, the custom prevailing of designating particular *chelkoth* by proper names. This seems to imply that their limits were permanently fixed; but traces still appear of the *śadeh* being the whole of which these

[1] Obed was, apparently, the only son of Boaz, certainly the eldest; and yet he is always called the son of Boaz, not of Mahlon. But Boaz' name, and the semi-romantic circumstances of his marriage, were too famous to be forgotten as those of a less eminent man might be.

[2] The word is the same that was used of the property. The phrase 'to sell a daughter' seems (Gen. xxxi. 15; Exod. xxi. 7) to imply disparagement of the marriage found for her, but this converse phrase 'to buy' a wife does not.

Digitized by Google

chelkoth were conceived as parts. In 1 Sam. vi. 12, we seem to find it still cultivated in common: 'The lords of the Philistines went after' the Ark 'unto the landmark of Bethshemesh. And *Bethshemesh were reaping their* wheat-harvest in the valley: . . . and the cart came into the field (*śadeh*) of Joshua the Bethshemite, and stood there; where there was a great stone,' probably the 'landmark of Bethshemesh' already mentioned, or if not the landmark of Joshua's own *chelkah*. 'And the Levites took down the Ark of the Lord, and the coffer that was with it, wherein the jewels of gold were, and put them *on the great stone*' as being a sacred spot, perhaps a *terminus*, as in the next chapter Samuel's 'great stone' Ebenezer seems to be the boundary of the territory recovered for the Philistines; but perhaps its sacredness is rather to be illustrated by the reverence for Jacob's 'pillar' and the Canaanite *βαιτύλια*.

In the curious episode of 2 Sam. xiv. 29 *sqq.*, the fact that Joab's 'allotment' was near Absalom's may be explained in either of two ways, not quite excluding each other. They were first cousins, and Jessè may, like Job, have given his daughters inheritance among their brethren, so that the sons of Zeruiah and of David had lots in the family property at Bethlehem.[1] Or it may be—as the narrative would lead us to suppose that the *chelkoth* were in the *śadeh* of Jerusalem rather than in that of Bethlehem—that David at his election to the throne received a domain, including perhaps his ancestral property, but consisting chiefly of land conquered from the Philistines, Jebusites, &c. Then David, we may infer, 'lived of his own,' not on taxes levied on the people: according to the view of constitutional fitness in England in the fifteenth century. Certainly we never hear in

[1] Joab and his brethren are always designated by their mother's name, and Amasa usually by his mother's, together with his father's; a presumption that the mothers were heiresses. Compare in 1 Chron. ii. 31 the interesting genealogy of Nathan (probably the prophet) which at one point is traced through a female. Ahlai, indeed, was not only an heiress, but married a non-Israelite; so indeed did Abigail, and so Zeruiah may have done. But Amasa's father, though called 'an Ishmaelite' (1 Chron. ii. 17), was perhaps one of 'the children of the Kenite, Moses' father-in-law,' who were apparently incorporated in the tribe of Judah (Judges i. 16, 1 Chron. ii. 55: cf. 1 Sam. xv. 6, xxvii. 10, xxx. 29, *si vera l.*); the names יֶתֶר, יִתְרוֹ, יִתְרְאָם are substantially the same. If, therefore, Amasa was practically an Israelite on the father's side, we should have to suppose that his mother, 'Abigail, the daughter of Nahash,' derived her importance from other causes than purity of blood. Did she inherit from *her* mother Nahash, while Jesse's inheritance was divided among his sons?

Digitized by Google

David's reign, as we do in his son's, of oppressive taxation or task-work. Though there were wars throughout its course, and public works at the end of it, the former were no doubt made self-supporting, and the latter were done 'of mine own proper good' (1 Chron. xxix. 3). And in like manner, we may be sure that such a 'Prince' as David did 'not take of the people's inheritance by oppression, to thrust them out of their possession; but he gave his sons inheritance out of his own possession' (Ezek. xlvi. 18): and so in case of grants to 'his servants' too; though the Prince did not resume these at the Jubilee, since we find the name of Chimham, the son of Barzillai, lasting at Bethlehem down to the Captivity, Jer. xli. 17.

From David's time onward, traces of communal land tenure become fewer. For a long period, we hear nothing of these domestic and agrarian interests; the monarchy overlies them in the narrative, as Samuel foretold (1 Sam. viii. 12, 13) that it would override them in fact. When we do again meet with the *chelkath haś-śadeh*, it is only to hear of its absorption by monarchical tyranny: Naboth's vineyard is so called in 2 Kings ix. 25 *sqq.*[1] But this *chelkah* has all the characteristics of strictly private property; it is the 'inheritance of his fathers' to which the honest Naboth has a sentimental attachment, proof against the offer of a better vineyard than it: and it is so certain that his sons will inherit it after him, that they have to be put to death with him, before it can be confiscated. In fact, a piece of land once planted with a permanent stock like the vine cannot have been held subject to the chances of reallotment, like one bearing a mere annual crop; and we may well believe that in Naboth's righteous indignation at Ahab's proposal one element was, that he thought it a desecration to transform a vineyard into a common 'garden of herbs' (cf. Jos. *Ant.* IV. viii. 20 *init.*).

The question then arises, had the communal system, of which we have seen traces in Canaan, before and after the Israelite conquest, now, in the middle period of the monarchy, become obsolete and left no traces except a few 'survivals' in popular usages, or etymologies in popular language? The word *chelkah*, it is plain, was now applied to land not subject to annual or septennial 'allotment': was the possibility of such allotment really forgotten?

[1] The cognate word חֵלֶק is used, *ib.* ver. 9, apparently almost in the same sense as שָׂדֶה, 'the *portion* of Jezreel.'

Digitized by Google

It suggests an answer to this question, that we find the frequent and often distinctive use, from the age of the Law to that of the Captivity, of a word the sense of which it seems harder to part from its etymology than חֶלְקָה, viz. חֶבֶל, literally 'line' or 'cord.' In Deut. iii. 4, 13, 14, the district of Argob is described as a *chebel*, and it is still so called (1 Kings iv. 13) in the time of Solomon. But this district had no exclusive claim to the title, which is used in a quite general sense in Jos. xvii. 5, 14, xix. 9, 29. Setting aside the doubtful passage 2 Sam. viii. 2 (where the most that can be said is, that some sort of lottery seems to be intended), we find the word in more than one of the Psalms of David's time or soon after (Ps. xvi. 6, lxxviii. 55, cv. 11, 1 Chron. xvi. 18). And while all the passages point to a reminiscence of the original partition of the Promised Land by actual allotment, in the first, at least, the use of the image seems to imply familiarity with the literal reality. We must compare it with the expression in the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 9), where (according to the probable reading of the LXX.) the Lord is conceived as allotting the whole world, which is His kingdom, among His sons and His servants, but reserving Israel and the land of Israel to Himself as His own special domain: 'The Lord's lot is His people; Jacob is the line of His inheritance.' Now what He is conceived as doing by this bold figure—what David himself (as we saw from 2 Sam. xiv. 30) had actually and literally done—David in Ps. xvi. conceives as done for him in a sense the exact converse of that of Moses: 'The Lord is the portion of my allotment (חֶלְקִי) and of my cup: Thou maintainest my lot (גּוֹרָלִי). The lines (חֲבָלִים) are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, a fair heritage (נַחֲלָה) [is devolved] upon me.' David may or may not have written these words with such passages as Num. xvii. 20, Deut. x. 9, &c. in his mind; but, at any rate, the sentiment is a parallel one, and it occurs often in both his own and later Psalms.

But if it be the fact that, between the age of David and that of Ahab, the primitive communal land tenure had virtually given place to a system of private ownership, hereditary but (owing to neglect of the law of jubilee) transferable almost at will, the practical result would be, in an ancient as in a modern society, the extinction of the class of peasant proprietors, and accumulation of the land in a few hands. But, whatever may be said of the good or evil of such a change in modern society, in an ancient one it was unquestionably disastrous: it meant, not that the possession

Digitized by Google

of land became a luxury, and that those who worked for necessaries worked at something else, but that the rich were growing richer, and the poor poorer; nay, that the poor freemen were becoming slaves to the rich. The course of legal oppression was set in motion, which tore society in pieces, in every community of the ancient world whose inner life is known to us, by making capital the natural enemy of labour—πόλεις εἰσὶ πάμπολλαι ἀλλ' οὐ πόλις (Plat. *Rep.* iv. 422 E). At best the yeoman was expropriated by such means as Ahab thought fair, holding in reserve such means as Jezebel thought efficient; oftener, the common law of debt and of slavery for debt would divorce him from his land even more completely. We know how *latifundia perdidere Italiam*: we shall see how they ruined Samaria and Judæa too.[1]

It is hardly a generation after Ahab's time, whose conscience was really shocked by the treatment of Naboth, when we find the system of legal oppression in full force. We read of a widow crying to Elisha, 'Thy servant my husband is dead . . . and *the* creditor' (it is taken as a matter of course that there is one) 'is come to take unto him my two sons to be bondmen.' Doubtless this was a representative case, nor was it in every such case that a prophet intervened. The social distress was intensified by the long war with Syria, nor was it alleviated by the turn in the fortunes of that war, under Joash and Jeroboam II. The luxurious and sensual nobles denounced by Hosea and the Jewish peasant Amos may or may not have borne their part in the campaigns whereby those kings 'recovered the cities of Israel;' if they did, they doubtless had their reward in slaves and plunder after every victory, and they lost little or nothing by leaving their home estates under the charge of a confidential overseer, whether a freedman or a hireling. But their poor yet still free neighbours, when they marched up to Hamath or beyond the Jordan, left their fields unreaped, if not unsown. In the field of battle they had no equal chance of glory or of profit with men who fought in chariots and in complete armour: and if, after the battle, they were restrained by discipline, or by their own religion and patriotism, from plundering their Gileadite brethren in whose land they fought, they might go home with clean hands, to find there 'cleanness of teeth,' their fields unstocked, their families starving, and the tithe-paying, chapel-going, psalm-singing, sabbath-keeping merchants of Shechem and Samaria offering

[1] See Cheyne on Is. v. 8.

Digitized by Google

them spoilt corn in short measure, at high prices, with high interest for credit;—they had no cash but boys and girls.

Hosea and Amos prophesy against the Northern Kingdom only or chiefly; they intimate that in Judah things were bad, but not so bad. The quarrel between Amaziah and Joash must have caused much suffering to the subjects of the former; on the other hand, the reign of Uzziah was orderly and prosperous: though it is an ambiguous sort of prosperity to be under a king who 'loved ground' and 'had much cattle.' Probably, indeed, we are not to understand that the prosperity of Uzziah himself was gained at his people's expense; still it is clear that there was a good deal of social corruption, especially if we refer the early chapters of Isaiah to this reign. Under Jotham we read that 'the people did yet corruptly,' though the chronicler has nothing but good to say of the king himself; but his son Ahaz was the man of all others to ruin a kingdom, if one man could do it. A youth (if we may trust the figures[1] of the present text), with both body and mind enfeebled and corrupted by premature harem life, he brought Judah and Jerusalem to a lower state in every respect than they had yet fallen, even under the usurpation of Athaliah, or the conquests of Shishak and Joash. His only foreign policy was *propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*; in religious matters, his timid and superstitious temper was easily revolted into blasphemy; and from capricious interference with the national worship, he passed into total neglect and suppression of it. Meanwhile, we may imagine the social state of the people, living under alternations of desolating invasions and burdensome tributes, while it was in this or the previous generation that the lords and ladies of Jerusalem had formed the habits described in the second and third chapters of Isaiah, habits of heartless luxury equal to that of their kinsmen at Samaria in Amos' time, though we hear less of their licentiousness.

But the evil was not incurable in Judah as it was in Israel: Isaiah himself intimates that it was to be met by a violent but efficacious remedy, 'by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning.' Isaiah does not specify what this puri-

[1] He died at 36, leaving a son of 25! But, as is well known, the numbers must be corrupt at some point in the Books of Kings; from the contemporary deaths of Jehoram and Ahaziah to the capture of Samaria in the sixth year of Hezekiah, the reigns of the Kings of Judah are about twenty years too long for those of the Kings of Israel; while it is thought that even the latter are too long by about as much for those of the Kings of Assyria. And 2 Kings xv. 30 seems to indicate that the confusion is just about this period.

Digitized by Google

fying judgment was to be; but his contemporary Micah uses, to say the least, a very suggestive image to describe it. In the beginning of his second chapter we read—

'Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds! When the morning is light, they practise it, because it is in the power of their hand. *And they covet fields* (שָׂדוֹת), *and take them by violence: and houses, and take them up. And they oppress a man and his house: and a husband and his heritage.* Therefore, thus saith the Lord: "Behold, I devise against this family (מִשְׁפָּחָה) evil[1]; from which ye shall not remove your necks: neither shall ye go haughtily; for it is an evil time. In that day shall one take up against you a parable: and lament with a lamentable lamentation. He shall say, 'We be utterly destroyed; *He hath transferred the allotment* (חֵלֶק) *of my people*: how hath He removed it from me! לְשׁוֹבֵב שָׂדֵינוּ יְחַלֵּק."'

It may be a question how לְשׁוֹבֵב, not a very common form,[2] is to be translated; but it seems worthy of consideration whether the three words do not mean, 'He hath reallotted our fields *in rotation*,' or '*by a revolution*.' At any rate, whatever may be said about לְשׁוֹבֵב, it can hardly be doubted that יְחַלֵּק suggests this sense—*ἀναδασμὸν τῆς γῆς ἐποίησεν*; and accordingly the Prophet goes on: 'Therefore there shall not be unto thee *one to cast a cord by lot* (מַשְׁלִיךְ חֶבֶל) בְּגוֹרָל) in the congregation of the Lord;' the land *shall* be redivided, and thou, who hast swallowed up thy neighbours' lots, shalt now have no lot for thyself.

Are we then to suppose that Hezekiah's religious reformation (in which, it seems implied in Jer. xxvi. 18, Micah's influence was the moving force) was accompanied by a social revolution, which our records pass over in silence? Perhaps not in the fullest sense; yet *some* redistribution there not improbably was. If the opinion be tenable that the date of Ezekiel's first vision 'in the thirtieth year' refers to its place in the Jubilee cycle, then Josiah's eighteenth year, the culminating point of his reformation, will have been the year of Jubilee, and was no doubt observed as such. Another Jubilee, probably not observed, will have fallen in Manasseh's reign, and another, which may have been observed (though not noticed either in Isaiah or in the historical books) in the fourth or fifth year of Hezekiah. At any rate, whether there

[1] In return for their 'devices of iniquity and evil work.'

[2] The conjugation occurs twelve times in the Old Testament; twice (Psalm xxiii. 3, Jer. l. 6), apparently, of 'transferring' a flock from one pasture to another, elsewhere of 'turning back,' or 'replacing:' four times in a hostile sense, six in a friendly. The first sense is not wholly alien to that here suggested.

Digitized by Google

was a revolution in his reign or no, it seems almost certain that there must have been an extensive social as well as religious reform.

It seems incredible to Professor Kuenen that a reformation like Hezekiah's should have been carried out without arousing earnest opposition, and leaving behind it deep discontent; and he concludes that such opposition and discontent existed, in spite of the silence of our authorities. And as to opposition at the time of the king's first proposals, he may, for aught that we know, be right; but, as to discontent after his measures were carried out, our authorities are somewhat more than silent; they tell us expressly that such discontent *was* to be expected, and was expected, but that it did not exist, even under the most trying circumstances.

In Thucydides' description of the misery caused by the Peloponnesian invasion of Attica (II. 14–17) it strikes a modern reader that he insists much on a point which he has no technical language to express briefly, but which he describes elaborately as important and peculiar—which to us, however, presents no peculiarity at all—*viz.*, that the right of Athenian 'citizenship' did not depend on nativity or residence in the 'city' of Athens. Athens was, we should say, the *Capital* of Attica; but to a Greek it was a more natural conception that Attica should be territory subject to Athens, as Laconia was the territory subject to the citizens of Sparta (Hdt. VII. ccxxxiv. 4, 5); as again at Rome the *plebs* were probably originally the people of the *Ager Romanus* as distinct from those of the *Urbs Roma*. We all know how the greatness of Rome was dependent on this admission to citizenship of men beyond the local limits of the city; it is probable that the same may be said of the greatness of Athens. And of the only other city in the world comparable in importance or interest with Athens and Rome, it is even more true than of either that it was not an independent civic community, but the centre, the capital, of a nation and a country. '*Pars magna Judaeae vicis dispergitur: habent et oppida. Hierosolyma genti caput*,' says Tacitus: 'The glory . . . of the inhabitants of Jerusalem shall not magnify itself against Judah,' says the Prophet Zechariah. The most indispensable element in patriotism, the binding sense of the indissoluble unity of the nation, was from Nehemiah's time as strong in Israel as it ever was at Rome, stronger than at Athens; but, while the visible centre at Jerusalem represented the national unity, that unity itself had a wider range than the walls of Jerusalem.

Digitized by Google

But, whereas the unity of the Athenian nation was primarily political, and avoided crushing the local elements of independent life by respecting the local religions, the unity of Israel was primarily religious; it was the political life that was decentralized and enjoyed local freedom. Israel had 'judges and officers in all their gates,' 'rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens'[1] (Ex. xviii. 21, 25; Deut. xvi. 18, cf. Jos. *Ant.* IV. viii. 14). Attica had in every city 'temples which had been the seats of their hereditary worship from the time of their ancient civic independence,' but had no 'town-hall nor magistrates' except in the capital.

Such at least was the difference that ought to have underlain the political likeness; but under the kings of Judah, from Solomon (at latest) to Hezekiah, local sanctuaries existed, almost as numerous and as venerable as in Attica. But all the more would the social effects of an invasion of Judæa, or siege of Jerusalem, resemble those of an invasion of Attica and siege of Athens. It was a misery to the people of either country to 'do nothing less than abandon each his own city,' and crowd into the capital; yet this they were forced to do, if they would not submit to the enemy. There they camped in the courts of the temples, or along the lines of the ramparts, a prey ready for the famine or pestilence that was shortly to be expected.

Accordingly, Sennacherib or his Rab-shakeh saw that there was as good hope of incensing the Jews against Hezekiah as Archidamus saw of incensing the Athenians against Pericles; and the Rab-shakeh's speech 'in the ears of the people that sat on the wall' (Thuc. II. xvii. 1, 3) is an attempt, not without ability, to do so. But the people withstood the temptation, and remained resolutely loyal: 'They held their peace, and answered him not a word: for the king's commandment was, saying, "Answer him not."' Hezekiah's religious and patriotic zeal may have been contagious, Isaiah's promises of final deliverance may have inspired faith: still, the mass of men are rarely loyal and never religious when their material interests suffer from it. But if, for every high place and altar that Hezekiah threw down, there was a local tyrant made to disgorge his neighbours' fields, it is intelligible

[1] We have seen that these divisions, like our own 'hundreds and tythings,' seem to have been adapted to a local basis. Besides the 'thousands,' we hear of 'the captain of fifty' as late as Isaiah (iii. 3), apparently as a civil as well as military officer. In 2 Chron. xxv. 5, xxvi. 12, we see that the genealogical basis was not forgotten.

Digitized by Google

that a devotion should have been inspired to the Law of Moses and to the king who enforced it, which, if not disinterested, was yet honourable: it stood the test of days or weeks of misery, and three years of scarcity.

It may be added that a redistribution of lands would be all the easier, because the slaughter of the war between Pekah and Ahaz must have left much of the land of Judah practically ownerless; while the generous conduct of the Israelites after their victory points to a sense of reviving brotherhood between the kingdoms. The miserable Hoshea, we are told, 'did evil in the sight of the Lord, yet not like the kings of Israel that were before him;' that is, probably, he was as well content to see his subjects attend the Passover at Jerusalem as Palæologus to submit to the Pope. But it was too late for a real 'corporate reunion;' even if Ephraim itself had been united, their envy against Judah had been inflamed by the prejudice of centuries. 'Nevertheless, divers of Asher and of Manasseh and of Zebulon humbled themselves, and came to Jerusalem;' and if they were wise, when once there they never went back. (2 Chron. xxx. 11; cf. xxxi. 6.) In the country depopulated by the wars of the last reign, 'fresh households,' and those households who loved the Lord and hated the Assyrian, must have been an acceptable reinforcement; while they came recommended to their new neighbours, not only by the almost forgotten tie of blood, but by the recent one of hospitality, which was held to exist (*Il.* xxi. 74 *sqq.*) between a prisoner of war and his captor, even if his treatment were less generous than that enforced by Oded.

As for those who 'laughed to scorn and mocked' Hezekiah's proposals, their fate was sealed. Ephraimites are mentioned among the ill-prepared pilgrims to his great Passover, but their numbers were apparently inconsiderable, compared with those from the poorer tribes further north. Oded perhaps could have told Pekah or Hoshea, but we cannot tell, what might have happened if those kings had thrown themselves upon the piety or the generosity of Judah; as it was, Hoshea preferred the meaner but more ambitious course of playing fast and loose with the Assyrian and Ethiopian empires. He only succeeded in over-reaching himself: his personal fall even preceded that of his kingdom. In the preceding reign, Isaiah (vii. 8, 9) had pointed out the instability of a power that depended on a single city and a single man: Hoshea had killed the man and failed to fill his place, and the city could not maintain itself without him. The serf population of the country seem to have made no resistance at all;

Digitized by Google

the nobles and burghers of Samaria resisted as desperately as their Syrian allies had lately done at Damascus, or as their Jewish kinsmen did afterwards at Jerusalem, and their Canaanite neighbours at Tyre and Carthage. But still the strife was hopeless; even the change of dynasty among the besiegers failed to relax their grasp upon the place, and 'at the end of three years they took it.' We may imagine, from the analogy of the successive 'captivities' of Jehoiakim, Jeconiah, and Zedekiah, what was the condition of Samaria between its capture by Sargon and the time when 'Ephraim was broken that it be not a people' (Isaiah vii. 8), under his grandson. But we know nothing of it in detail, except that one Menahem king of Samaria (while even Hoshea had been 'king of Israel') accompanied Sennacherib in his attack upon Hezekiah.

Of the era of 'peace and truth' that closed Hezekiah's days we have hardly any historical notices; neither have we many details of the degradation of the kingdom under his son. 'The innocent blood which he shed' is referred by tradition to a persecution of the Prophets of his father's reign; whether this be right or no, it seems to be characteristic only, or chiefly, of his administration in Jerusalem itself, and so throws no light on the social or economical state of the country. But when, under Josiah and his sons, we again have extant writings from contemporary Prophets, we find things even worse than they had been at a similar period before the fall of the kingdom of Israel. Jerusalem is to Zephaniah 'filthy and polluted, the oppressing city;' Samaria had been as bad in the eyes of Amos. But to the earlier Prophet the masses of the people had appeared morally sound, though oppressed and miserable; 'the righteous' was always an admissible word in one hemistich to balance 'the poor' in the other. Jeremiah, on the contrary (v. 4, &c.), finds the form of godliness remaining only among the rich, and its power nowhere; the poor are in his time a degraded and uneducated proletariate; the Prophet himself thinks their spiritual state as hopeless as it seemed to the sacerdotal hierarchy of his time, or to the scholastic hierarchy of the Christian era. With this agrees Ezekiel's description (xxxiii. 25 *sqq.*) of the moral character of the men who, upon the Chaldæan invasion, had taken to a more or less patriotic brigandage: they were as licentious and unscrupulous as the nobles of Jerusalem, and no more regular, while perhaps less zealous, in their wild and spasmodic religion.

This general corruption seems to date from the reign

Digitized by Google

of Manasseh, uninterrupted by the earnest but superficial reformation of Josiah. But the social oppression, which doubtless helped to cause or intensify the degradation of the poor, was interrupted in his reign, and an interval of prosperity seems to have been the result, though Huldah and Jeremiah foresaw that it would not last. He 'did eat and drink, and do judgment and justice: then it was well with him.... he judged the cause of the poor and needy,' 'executing judgment and righteousness, and delivering the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: doing no wrong, nor violence to *the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow*,' neither shedding innocent blood in Jerusalem' (Jer. xxii. 15, cf. v. 1). His genial, high-spirited character, which we may trace even in his fatal war with Egypt, gained him a general popularity, equal to the high praise bestowed on him by our prophetical and priestly historians. Jeremiah plainly intimates that, if his sons had been like him, the country might even yet have been saved. As it was, its ruin followed speedily; in that ruin we may distinguish two periods, the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah.

By two wives Josiah had four sons (1 Chron. iii. 15): but of the eldest we know nothing but his name; he perhaps died before or with his father. Of Shallum or Jehoahaz, who was made king in preference to his elder brother, we have a bad character in the Book of Kings: Jeremiah gives him up regretfully. But we have no details of the faults either of his life or of his rule; those of his half-brother and successor Jehoiakim we learn from Jer. xxii. 13 *sqq.*, compared with 2 Kings xxiii. 35. It perhaps was not his fault, but the fruit of the impoverishment of the kingdom, that he had to raise money by taxation for the tribute to Nechoh, instead of paying it, as former kings had done, 'out of the treasures of the House of the Lord and of the king's house;' but such impoverishment made it only the more inexcusable that the king strove to keep up his personal state and luxury by exactions in money and in labour from his already overburdened people. Wilfully and recklessly irreligious, he was wilfully and recklessly oppressive also; abroad his policy was characterized neither by valour nor discretion nor good faith; altogether, he lived and died in favour with neither God nor man.

Of his son Jehoiachin we know as little as of Jehoahaz; while he is condemned in the same terms by the Scriptural history, Jeremiah's sentence upon him is almost as regretful; and he left behind an affectionate remembrance, apparently among his contemporaries, and certainly among the Jews of

Digitized by Google

later times. But Zedekiah, in proportion as he is more clearly pictured to us in Jeremiah's prophecies, seems to us even more worthy of pity. Under him the monarchy is almost transformed into an oligarchy;[1] and the people suffer as much by the change as by the similar one in Greece or Rome. Once at least, in the crisis of the Chaldæan siege, the king made an effort to redress their wrongs and perhaps to reassert his own power; but the approach of Hophra's army, which reopened communications between Jerusalem and the country, seemed to the mad selfishness of the nobles to afford an opportunity for re-enslaving their countrymen; and the king could not or would not prevent them. Then the captivity became not only inevitable, but desirable. Jeremiah, who all along had urged the Government to submission, began now to urge individuals to desertion: it was no crime to be traitors to a country that was already a traitor to them. In truth, the people needed no urging to make them submit. Jerusalem and two other fortified cities resisted desperately; numerous but apparently small guerrilla bands overran the country; but the peasantry at large felt that it was by far the best thing that could happen to them that the King of Babylon should slay all the nobles of Judah, or carry away all the princes and all the mighty men of valour; he was sure to leave of the poor of the people, which had nothing, in the land of Judah, and give them vineyards and fields; or, if they had to go to Babylon too, still there they would start on an equality with their old oppressors. Rabshakeh's parody[2] of Moses' promise would be acceptable to those who, unlike their ancestors whom he addressed, had lost the original.

It is remarkable how little the Captivity made a lasting breach of continuity in the national life; the course of political and social development was resumed at almost the same point where it had been interrupted. It can scarcely

[1] Mr. Cheyne (on Is. vii. 13, &c.) supposes this change to have begun much earlier. But the evidence hardly supports his view: the 'house of David' is not likely to have been numerous for some generations after the massacres of Jehoram, Athaliah, and Jehu. Nor is it proved that the 'princes' of Jeremiah's time are identical with the 'house of David;' none of them are traced up to a royal ancestor.

[2] 2 Kings xviii. 32 reads like a conscious reference to Deut. viii. 8. We need not, in view of recent evidence as to the literary culture of the Assyrian Court, be afraid to admit the conception, strangely modern as it seems, of the clever, cynical minister of a fanatical conqueror studying in cold blood the sacred books of the religion which his master desires to suppress, but which he would rather prefer bending to his own purposes.

Digitized by Google

be said that even the monarchy was abolished by the Babylonian conquest; for the Persians, according to their general custom (Hdt. iii. 15) placed at the head of the people the man who (whatever was his exact pedigree) was the recognized heir of the old royal line. But this quasi-monarchy seems not to have been transmitted, even for a single generation;[1] it disappeared, as the titular monarchy had threatened to do, from internal causes.

And the social troubles of the incipient oligarchy reappeared with the oligarchy itself. The internal structure of the nation, based on hereditary descent, had not been disorganized too hopelessly to be reconstructed, though apparently in Nehemiah's time it *had* to be reconstructed, very laboriously and only partially. But any connexion between this tribal organization and the land had of course disappeared altogether; and it perhaps had the less chance of reappearing, as the land customs of the country of their captivity allowed the maximum of independence to the individual proprietor. The Prophet Ezekiel, in his vision of the restoration, does not conceive the various tribes replaced in their several inheritances, as in the days of Joshua; even Jerusalem apparently is not restored, but its place taken by a new Holy City founded at the central point of the land; while the territory is distributed in 'rapes,' like the county of Sussex. Only one word suggests a reminiscence of the older division; when it is said that 'Joseph shall have two *portions*,' the old word *chebel*, 'cord,'[2] is used.

Ezekiel stands between the ages before and after the Captivity, with little practical relation to either. In the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah we hear a good deal of the unsatisfactory condition of the people during the eighteen years immediately after the return; the words of the former (Hag. ii. 17) might be understood simply of the series of bad seasons; but Zech. viii. 10 suggests that the unfruitfulness of their husbandry was also due to social disturbances and discontent. And seventy or eighty years later we know that the social distress had reappeared, in exactly its old form; the rich advance money or stock to the poor at high interest, and enslave their children and lands as soon as they

[1] Unless the Rhesa of S. Luke iii. 27 be (as Bishop Hervey suggests) a title; though not of Zerubbabel himself, but of one of his sons.

[2] What the 'cord' or 'rape' (usually explained as = 'rope') was, and how it was used in measuring or assigning the lots, are matters of almost hopeless conjecture for the present. They may be elucidated in time, if more be learnt about the methods of Egyptian and Assyrian land surveying.

Digitized by Google

fail to repay. Nehemiah has to deal with the same state of things as Solon had a little earlier, or—still more exactly—as M. Manlius had a little later. Like the former, he succeeded through the influence of his noble public character, and the contagious example of his personal disinterestedness. But the Jew had this advantage over the Athenian, and still more over the Roman, that, instead of his reforms being revolutionary, and such as he himself refused to allow as precedents, they consisted simply in a reversion to the oldest and most sacred institutions of the people. Nehemiah, by himself, might or might not have saved the remnant of the Israelite nation, whereon to found the Jewish Church; but his success was secured by the safeguards which Moses had provided in his original plan for the nation's life.

From Nehemiah's time onwards we hear absolutely nothing of economical grievances or class hatreds among the Jews, little or nothing of social jealousies, until the last few years before the fall of the nation, when a new oligarchy arose in the high-priestly caste. A constantly increasing population, more than sustained by assiduous and not unskilled industry in agriculture, and a few simple manufactures, relieved by an economically profitable emigration, which scarcely impaired the sense of national unity, enjoying, moreover, sufficient leisure for the cultivation of at least one intellectual interest: this is a social result not so often attained, but that it must approve the legislation which secured it to the most secular standard of judgment. But any communal element there had been in the older Jewish agrarian economy had now completely disappeared; when communism revived among the primitive Christians, no one thought of organizing it on an agrarian basis. Only in a few customs, recognizing public rights over private land,[1] there may possibly be reminiscences of the time when private ownership was less exclusive.

[1] Ten such customs are enumerated, traditionally ascribed to Joshua and his Council, and one to Solomon (*Baba Kama*, c. 7 extr., ap. Selden, *De Jure Gentium juxta disc. Ebr.* vi. 2). Most are mere protests against the dog-in-the-manger temper of Harry Gill: but there may be vestiges of real communal rights in the first and sixth—one allowing cattle, under certain conditions, to be pastured in woods without asking the owner's leave, the other restricting to the *tribes* whose *lot* was on the Sea of Tiberias the right of fishing there with boats and nets, while anyone might fish with the angle.

Digitized by Google

ART. VII.—THE SUPPLY OF CLERGY.

1. *Le Grand Péril de l'Eglise de France au XIXe Siècle.* Par M. l'Abbé BOUGAUD, Vicaire-Général d'Orléans. Avec une Carte teintée indiquant la Géographie et la Statistique de la diminution des Vocations Sacerdotales.
2. *Œuvres du R. P. H. D. Lacordaire, des Frères Prêcheurs.* Tome IX.
3. Letter in the *Guardian*, January 21, 1880. By M. l'Abbé MARTIN, Professor in the Catholic University at Paris.
4. Article on the *French Church of the Nineteenth Century. Ib.*
5. Letter from the same writer in the *Guardian*, Feb. 4, 1880.
6. Article in the *Guardian* of the same date on the *Church in France.*

WE are told by the Vicar-General of Orleans, the learned and experienced writer of the first work on our list, that the question discussed in it is really one of life and death to the Church of France at this moment.

A consideration of the 'Great Peril' which now besets the Church in France must be fraught with instruction and warning to the other branches of the Church, and of course, therefore, to the Church in England. It is a consideration of the highest and mightiest import—no less than this: How is the priesthood in France to be maintained in the face of a continual falling off in the number of candidates for Holy Orders? Some portion of this dark shadow which now broods over the French Church appeared at one time to be hovering over our own Church, and, though lately much withdrawn,[1] still threatens her both at home and in her Colonies and in her missions to the heathen. But there does not need any immediate participation in the evil to render English Churchmen full of sympathy with the Church in France at this crisis of her existence.

[1] See Letter of Mr. Armfield in *Guardian* of January 21, 1880, as to 'Candidates for Ordination':—'The alarming falling off in students for the ministry in the American Church a few years ago seems to have been to some extent corrected It called forth at the time most earnest and anxious discussion. This year the American Church Almanac reports 303 candidates for deacons' orders, against 229 last year. Still this is far below the number in 1872, when 416 were reported. And yet, from 1872 to 1880 the whole number of the clergy has increased from 2,900 to 3,375. In the same time the total number of communicants in the Church has grown from 232,354 to 323,713, an increase of 72 per cent.'

Digitized by Google

Nevertheless, it would be well to place and keep steadily before our minds the real nature of that evil. Unchecked in its course of decay, and carried to its furthest conceivable extent, it would at last be no less than a drying up, in France, of those channels of Sacramental Grace through which it has pleased God that the mercies of Redemption shall be conveyed to man. It pleased Our Lord, while on earth, to institute an external, visible Christian Ministry, and to require its continuance upon earth until His coming again.

We learn from the Holy Scriptures,[1] and from Catholic tradition, that the means by which He, and the Apostles in obedience to Him, thought proper to attain this end were establishing the *potestas ordinis*, that is, the ordination of certain persons to minister unto men 'things pertaining to God,' and the authority of certain persons to rule the Church —*potestas jurisdictionis*—with power to appoint their successors, having the like authority. It was not to be competent to any person in any place to take upon himself the office of Christian priest or deacon. There was to be a *legitima ordinatio* and a *legitima missio* of the Christian priest.

To the well-educated Churchman these remarks may appear commonplace and unnecessary; but they may help the ordinary reader to appreciate the great importance of the questions so ably discussed in the pamphlet before us. It is divided into eight chapters. The first relates to the fact of the diminution of the candidates for the priesthood. The writer begins by impressing upon his readers that the vital question for the Church of France at this moment is not so much whether she possesses a sufficient number of priests to recover the sheep which have deserted her fold, as whether her spiritual power is sufficient to minister to the souls of those who have remained, outwardly at least, faithful to her.

It was at the beginning of this century that M. de Maistre stated, with all the force—and that is no light word—of which he was capable, that the enfeebled condition of the sacerdotal class imperatively demanded the immediate attention of the State. He called upon the higher classes to offer their children as in times past to the service of the Altar, and 'Oh,' he said, 'if I had under my eyes a tabular statement of the sacerdotal ordinations, I should be able to predict great results.' His prediction as yet has been very far from being

[1] 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that you should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My name, He may give it you.'—S. John xv. 16, Heb. v. 4–10.

Digitized by Google

fulfilled. The higher classes have poured out their blood like water in defence of their country, have given their daughters to minister in communities of the Sacré-Cœur, and in the performance of all works of charity; but, alas! the road to the sanctuary and the priesthood has been trodden by few, and the worst is not yet stated.

The rural classes, upon whose allegiance the Church has always counted, and which have supplied so many of her ministers, no longer contribute to supply the needs of the Sanctuary. The wound seems to widen and fester as you look at it. Here is 'le Grand Péril de l'Eglise de France.' There are doubtless many other dangers which beset her; but the silent diminution of the numbers of her priesthood is the present peril which is undermining her position.

In his Pastoral Letter of August 1877 the Archbishop of Tours said: 'Les vocations ecclésiastiques *diminuent presque partout d'une manière vraiment inquiétante;* et la même où les grands séminaires sont jusqu'ici suffisamment pourvus, les faibles rentrées des petits séminaires imposent les plus grandes craintes pour l'avenir.' It would be difficult to state more clearly and concisely the imminence of the peril which is now besetting the Church in France.

Nor is this peril, so to speak, of yesterday. At the epoch of the restoration of the Bourbons, a cry of distress arose from the Bishops as to the multitude of churches unserved by pastors. At first it seemed that the evil was abating; but this period was of short duration, and a disheartening ebb followed upon the temporary flood which had seemed to bear upon its surface the desiderated increase of the priesthood. What Abbé Bougaud calls the *Recrutement du Sacerdoce* soon abated, and then stopped; and there that falling off of candidates began which, in spite of occasional and isolated efforts, has ever since continued.

It should here be observed that the figures on which the Abbé relies, and which he says are absolutely certain and official, are those of the year 1877; and though upon this point we must speak with diffidence, it does not appear to us that their general accuracy is in any respect materially impugned by the Abbé Martin's attack upon the author of the pamphlet. Most certainly M. Martin is not justified in his statement that this great question is treated by the Abbé Bougaud in a brief, perfunctory, inconsiderate, irreverent manner. We hardly ever remember to have read a more unfounded censure.[1] It seems to us that the author of the

[1] There is indeed one analogy—one only—which appears to us in

Digitized by Google

pamphlet rightly thinks that a true and earnest statement of an existing evil, and a resolute inquiry into its causes, is a greater proof of loyalty to the Church than any attempt to 'skin and film the ulcerous place,' and let the evil continue 'mining all within.'

At Orleans in 1855, according to the letter of Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, 129 priests were wanted for the most pressing necessities of the diocese. In 1861, the Archbishop of Sens put forth a 'Mandement' for Lent, in which he complained that, while there were in the diocese of Sens 514 parishes and as great a number of religious institutions requiring the presence of a priest, there were only 442 priests employed, and that in many of the parishes the priests were obliged to perform a double service—a practice strongly discouraged by the Canon Law.[1] At Périgueux in 1866 the number of priests and of 'vicaires,' or curates, were altogether disproportioned to the spiritual needs of the diocese. Four years afterwards this distinguished prelate complained that this grievous wound had not been healed, but, on the contrary, was widening from day to day, and was assuming, with respect to certain matters, alarming proportions ('d'effrayantes proportions').

The next position of the writer is that the malady is not only terrible but increasing. And this position he supports by an enumeration of the suffering dioceses. It is everywhere, he says, the same spectacle: everywhere the evil becomes aggravated, at Rheims, at Dijon, at Langres, at Beauvais. And then he adds the following catalogue:—

'Evreux . 112 vacant cures and 14 vicariats (curacies).
Meaux . 92 vacant cures and 17 vicariats.
Soissons . 63 vacant cures and 29 vicariats.
Versailles 71 vacant cures and 7 vicariats.
Bayeux . 41 vacant cures and 45 vicariats.
Bourges . 47 vacant cures and 18 vicariats.
Dignes . 55 vacant cures and 14 vicariats.'

'Nothing' (says the writer) 'can be added to such figures as these, and alas! they are incontestable; they are the official figures for the year 1877.'

The next position of the writer is one which he considers

singularly bad taste: 'Donner un prêtre à l'Eglise, c'est tirer une lettre de change sur Dieu. Elle ne sera pas protestée' (p. 163).

[1] Decret. Greg. lib. iii.; Tit. xli. cap. iii.; Innocentius, iii. &c.: 'Respondemus, quod excepto die Nativitatis Dominicæ, nisi causa necessitatis suadeat, sufficit Sacerdoti semel in die unam missam solummodo celebrare.'

Digitized by Google

still more appalling. Until lately the malady had been confined to those portions of France in which infidelity had taken root. Now it has passed over these borders and invaded the best ordered dioceses, of which it is at this moment gnawing the very heart; and this statement he supports principally by reference to pastoral letters of the Bishops. There is one very striking fact which he mentions, namely, that when he first entertained the idea of preparing a Geographical and Statistical Map, such as is now appended to his pamphlet, of what he calls the Sacerdotal Vocation in France, he had intended that his first category should be that of dioceses in which there was a superabundance of priests; and twenty years ago it would have been possible to make such a category: but now he has searched in vain for any diocese to which it would be applicable. Every Revolution, says the author (speaking of Revolutions since 1815), has increased the peril. That of 1830 was fraught with mischief to the Church. The war of 1870 did more injury still. After each successive shock in the State the Church lost ground.

In his second chapter the author considers the principal causes which have brought about this diminution of sacerdotal vocations. There is one cause which lies on the surface, and is therefore often adopted as adequate, that is, general religious indifference. The homes of the parents who live without God, without Christ, without an altar, without prayers, without a priest, are not likely to furnish candidates for the priesthood. But obviously this solution of the difficulty leaves untouched the prior consideration: what has caused this religious indifference? The author perceives this, and digging deeper immediately discovers another cause, from which, he says, the former one springs. We do not stop to consider whether his proposition is logically accurate, or whether the converse of it would not be more true. The cause, in his opinion, is the wretched condition of the clergy generally, and especially of the country clergy.

An ardent faith might indeed induce the laity to think that the sublime honour of the priesthood compensated the absence of all worldly advantages. But such faith exists but rarely in France, and the ordinary parent sees nothing but the poverty of the priest, the solitude in which he lives, the ingratitude and too often the contempt which await his services. The priest, it is calculated, receives from the State about 900 francs a year. He has indeed, also, what is called *le casuel*, the voluntary offering of the layman. But in the country parishes that amounts to very little, seldom as much

Digitized by Google

as, and hardly ever above, 30 francs a year. But taking the 'casuel' of the cities, and allowing 300 francs for the 'casuel,' the salary of the priest might amount to 1,200 or, at the most, 1,300 francs a year. Moreover, the priest has no retiring pension, as other public functionaries have, and therefore, when his mind and body are exhausted, his old age is one of the most abject poverty. There is, indeed, the writer says, no grander spectacle than that of the country clergyman, with barely enough to support existence, visiting the sick, cherishing the poor, and giving something of the little which he has to the orphan, and then, having exhausted his purse, but not exhausted his heart, becoming a beggar for the beggar. In this age of luxury and wealth, when poverty is generally so hideous and so envious, the poverty which it is magnificent to see is the serene, cheerful, and beneficent poverty of the parish priest. Only it so happens that at the present time families do not recognize the magnificence of this poverty, and the parent prefers to place his son on the staff of the railway, or in a house of trade, rather than to educate him for the priesthood which he knows will cost him more, and will return less.

The author considers in his third and fourth chapters 'the great perils which the Church of France incurs by this diminution of candidates for the priesthood. He has some very eloquent and just remarks upon the blind folly of those who think that school can take the place of Religion, and that to teach a man to read, to write, and to count, is sufficient to make him virtuous. The author is far from disparaging the advantage of secular education, or from denying that it sheds a light upon the mind; but it is a light of a secondary character, and without the great light which descends from Heaven is apt to materialize the soul and corrupt the heart, especially in the case of the rural population. The author then returns to the subject of the spiritual destitution of France. He says that a comparison of the different dioceses in 1877 shows that there were 2,568 parishes unprovided with a priest.

The evil does not end there; for a pastoral ministry, even if sufficient, does not satisfy all the wants of the Church. The author dwells, as Lacordaire had done before him, upon the three great Agents necessary to maintain the vitality of the Church.[1] There is wanted, Lacordaire observes, the *Apostle*, who is to carry the teaching of the Gospel to distant countries; the resident *Pastor*, who is to teach the flock already gathered together, and who remains on one spot for the

[1] *Œuvres de Lacordaire*, Tome ix., pp. 85–6.

Digitized by Google

purpose of teaching them; the *Doctor*, whose office is the instruction of the priest and the defence of Evangelical truth. The last is necessarily a man of deep study and theological science, passing his life in the elucidation of Holy Scripture, traditions and dogmas, and the preservation of the Divine deposit committed to the keeping of the Church. One great need of the Church is the missionary preacher at home and abroad, fervent in spirit, rich in knowledge, eloquent in language. But, to produce such a preacher, time, leisure, retirement, and the means of support are necessary. The poverty and depressed condition of the Church render such a phenomenon very rare. It is the exception, while the rule is shown in the ill-educated, inexperienced, and half-starved priest.

The result, according to our author, is that, while the French Church discharges its duty with the greatest difficulty so far as the ministration of its pastors is concerned, it does so still less respecting the ministration of apostles, and it is altogether deficient with respect to the ministration of doctors. And what, says the author, is the consequence? 'There are in France immense *zones* in which the light of the Gospel scarcely shines at all' (p. 67). The zone of workmen, estimated at six millions; the zone of soldiers; the zone of those employed on the railways; the zone of the *savants*. All these are very feebly illumined by the light of the Gospel. To say that at the present moment there are more priests than there have been during this century, is to present a topic of little consolation. Religious indifference has been the disgrace and peril of the nineteenth century. Since the year 1790, four generations have passed away more or less steeped in religious indifference.

In the fourth chapter the author considers the obstinate determination of the richer classes to keep aloof from the priesthood.

In the remaining chapters, viz., the sixth, seventh and eighth, and in the *conclusion*, consisting of a few pages, the author points out that the time has arrived for the application of remedies to so sad a state of things, and states his opinion as to what those remedies are. Some remedy, the author says, would have been found if the rich classes, the 'noblesse' and the 'bourgeoisie,' which are called '*les classes dirigeantes*,' entered into the priesthood and brought to it the advantages of their name, their fortune, their education and their knowledge of the world. Not, indeed, that these classes could recruit in any great measure the army of the priest-

Digitized by Google

hood, which must always be, for the most part, taken from the people, as intimated by S. Paul (1 Cor. i. 18–31).

But this does not justify the rich in refusing altogether to serve in this holy army as they have done for the last sixty years. The author finds the causes of this great change, first, in the rich man's deplorable habit of bringing up his children to do nothing; secondly, in the indifference, and sometimes the repugnance and hostility, of the educated classes to all religion; thirdly—a very strange, but we fear a real cause—the intentional and systematic sterility of the marriage bed: 'Dans le mariage' (writes the Bishop of Beauvais), 'une stérilité, trop souvent calculée, par un égoïsme criminel, est hélas! un déplorable obstacle aux vocations saintes.'[1]

And now we must turn our attention to the most important, but also the feeblest, part of the pamphlet—namely, the remedies which are proposed for the evil. They may be summed up as follows: first, it is hardly necessary to say, special prayer to God for immediate aid; the intervention and agency of parents, especially of the mother, in determining the mind of the child to the sacerdotal vocation; then the direct intervention of the priest; then the school, if it deserve the name, 'l'école presbytère,' which is the boarding and teaching in the house of the priest of four children, the law of France not allowing more; then the 'Petit Séminaire,' a strictly religious school, for children of tender age, created by a reaction of feeling almost on the morrow of the Revolution. The last asylum which is open to the candidates for the priesthood is that of the Grand Séminaire, which the author thus describes: 'Le Grand Séminaire bears the same relation to the recruitment of the clergy that the École Polytechnique and the École de St. Cyr bear to the recruitment of the army. They are special schools, absolutely necessary. To suppress them, to lessen them, to starve them, is to persecute the Church in her most vital point ('au premier chef').' But the State bears unwillingly any portion of the expense necessary for the maintenance of these institutions, and the old obstacle of poverty again appears; the bishops are unable to bear any increase of expense towards their support, necessary as they are for the Church, and the faithful are urgently called upon to come to her assistance.

There is one remedy which has suggested itself to many minds: namely, the separation of Church and State. It is

[1] Page 84 of Pamphlet.

Digitized by Google

remarkable, both that the author does not believe it to be near at hand, and that he is adverse to such a separation, because he thinks it would not be loyally executed. It might indeed (he says) be, and is seen to be, possible in a new country like America; but in an old country like France, on which many revolutions have left their stamp (we do not see the force of this circumstance), it would only be hypocritical and not real. The Church would lose whatever resources she now has, and would remain in her present fetters. Her wretched pittance from the State would be refused to her; her right to acquire property would be denied, and so would even her right to beg; and yet the author inconsistently enough suggests that the Church, thus separated, would become so strong as to create an alarm in the State; and, lastly, he observes, that such a separation must be accompanied by an abandonment of all the concessions of the Concordat, and especially that which relates to the nomination of bishops. 'No government,' he says (and the words are very remarkable), 'not even a revolutionary one, would do that.'

To our minds these last observations of the author show very strongly, alas! the estrangement of the great bulk of the people from the Church. Modern history destroys the supposition that in an old country this separation of Church and State cannot take place. The disestablishment of the Roman Church, and of our own, in Ireland, and of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and the wonderful fact of our unestablished Colonial Churches, are among the circumstances which lead to a contrary conclusion. Disestablishment and disendowment are indeed very serious matters. The expedience of both the one and the other must depend on the circumstances of each particular case; but the Church which is conscious or apprehensive that she would perish without the aid of the State is not founded on a rock.

We hope we have done our duty in drawing the attention of our readers to this very remarkable pamphlet. To thoughtful Churchmen it is full of suggestion and deserves careful study. The merits and the demerits of our own ecclesiastical circumstances may be seen by the light which is reflected upon them from the condition of so near a neighbour as the Church in France.

We may learn from it a lesson of patience and hope,[1] not unmixed with congratulation, though chastened by a sense of the peculiar evils which threaten the Church of England.

[1] See the Ordination List of the English Church in the *Guardian*, January 21, 1880, by Mr. Armfield.

Digitized by Google

But, independently of these peculiar evils, the Church of England has been, as we have already noticed, not without a reasonable alarm, as to the dearth of candidates for ordination, though lately, indeed, there has been a considerable improvement in the number of such candidates. But if, in respect of quantity of candidates, the Church of England is not in immediate danger, we fear that as to the quality of them a different account must be given. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that, as compared with thirty or twenty-five years ago, a different and unhappily a lower class of mind is now enlisted in the service of the Church. This is really the meaning of the frequent Ordination of Literates which has become almost the rule, instead of the exception, in the Northern dioceses. And even the members of the Universities who are now ordained are not generally, though there are happily exceptions, men of the highest abilities or accomplishments, and we very greatly fear that the reason for this is to be found in the influences which now predominate in the Universities. Many a young man goes up to the university from a religious home with the intention of taking Holy Orders, but before he begins his studies for the theological school after taking his degree he has been brought into contact with companions, or perhaps even with tutors, who have led him to think that religious certainty is unattainable, or still further, that he cannot hope to grasp such a measure of religious probability as would warrant the devotion of a life to the profession of a priest. He naturally desires to work for something that will prove to be solid, and he turns his energies into the channel of the law or physical science, or to the pursuit of some secular business. We fear that in the Universities the Act of 1871 has largely contributed to bring about this state of things. It has legalized the position of non-Christian tutors entrusted with the care of Christian young men. We most earnestly hope that this evil will not be aggravated by any arrangement sanctioned by the present University Commissioners; and that, under the specious pretext of promoting religious equality, influences adverse to all religious belief will not be promoted. It is a serious question whether the success of infidel thought at the Universities is not doing as much mischief to the Church in England as Ultramontanism and superstition are doing to the Church of Rome.

It is not without sincere sorrow and anxiety that we close the pages of the work before us. For while the Great Peril is fully proved, the *remedies* proposed for it appear to us to be miserably insufficient; a natural and necessary consequence

Digitized by Google

of an imperfect investigation into the *causes* which have created it. These causes lie far deeper in the system than the Abbé Bougaud thinks, or at least admits. They are in part ascribable to the general ecclesiastical policy of Rome, and in part to the peculiar position of the Church in France. The Church of Bossuet, Massillon, Pascal, Bourdaloue no longer astonishes Europe, and enlightens France, by its eloquence and knowledge. The false doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility have now for the first time become the necessary *credenda* of the faithful. The sham miracles of Lourdes and La Salette are taught to the people by the ill-educated priest, while the bishop or the Pope avoids either a direct sanction or a direct condemnation of them. No distinction is drawn between these fraudulent and fantastic inventions and the miracles of our Lord and His apostles; and the latter, alas! too often share the disrepute which the former deservedly incur.

The writer of this review was staying in a country house in France, and on the Sunday a learned and distinguished French gentleman spoke to him about the sermon which he had just heard the curé deliver. 'Here,' said Monsieur M., 'is a country village, the bane of which is drunkenness. I go to church, and what does the curé preach to the poor people? A sermon against drunkenness? No, a sermon upon the Immaculate Conception!' It requires little reflection to perceive the effect which the promulgation of such new and untenable speculations must have upon a sceptical, and indeed upon an infidel, generation. Is it likely that it will win them over to attendance upon the Church if they do not now frequent it; or, if they do, will it keep them there? Is it probable that it will open their purses for the maintenance of ecclesiastical institutions?

And here it may be permitted to us for a moment to refer to the contrast afforded by the English laity, who, during the last forty years, have subscribed, in different ways and through different channels, many millions sterling for the support of their Church at home and abroad. The state of things upon which we have commented has naturally the effect of alienating the French layman; but there is yet another cause which diminishes the number of candidates for the priesthood. For it must be remembered that not only is the French priest ill-educated and ill-fed, and has celibacy enforced upon him, but he is also under such absolute control of his bishop as to be removable by him arbitrarily and without judicial procedure, though thereby reduced to a state of positive destitution.

Digitized by Google

It should be mentioned also, that, in the present system of the Gallican Church, Diocesan Councils, in which the clergy and laity meet together, have no place. This is not the least of the evil consequences of the absolute dependence of the Church of France upon the Vatican.

These are some of the principal causes which have really brought about 'Le Grand Péril de l'Église de France au XIXe Siècle.' They find no place, alas! in the interesting and able pamphlet of the Abbé Bougaud. The primary remedy is to remove these causes. Many years may pass away before it pleases God that this should be done, but we are afraid that until it be done the evil which the good Abbé so much deplores will continue, and in its continuance grow worse.

ART. VIII.—ON SOME MODERN PHILOSOPHY, AND THE SUPERNATURAL IN NATURE.

I.

1. *A Defence of Philosophic Doubt; being an Essay on the Foundations of Belief.* By ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, M.A., M.P. (London, 1879.)
2. *Lectures and Essays.* By the late WILLIAM KINGDON CLIFFORD, F.R.S. Edited by LESLIE STEPHEN and FREDERICK POLLOCK. In two vols. (London, 1879.)
3. *Hume.* By Professor HUXLEY. (London, 1879.)
4. *A Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant.* By EDWARD CAIRD, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. (Glasgow, 1877.)
5. *Shaw Fellowship Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant.* By ROBERT ADAMSON, M.A., Professor of Logic, Owen's College, Manchester; formerly Examiner in Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. (Edinburgh, 1879.)

II.

1. *The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined.* By THOMAS MARTIN HERBERT, M.A., late Professor of Philosophy and Church History in the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester. (London, 1879.)
2. *The Supernatural in Nature. A Verification by Free Use of Science.* (London, 1878.)

Digitized by Google

I. 1.

NEITHER the advocate of religion nor the votary of science can afford to neglect the deeper, more plausible, or more popular philosophical systems of his age. For philosophy is, or aims at being, the supreme court of Reason, and both religion and science claim to be reasonable. Both, indeed, admit as truths some propositions for which the understanding cannot find a logical justification; both are brought face to face with unexplained facts or mysteries which finite powers cannot fathom; but in the last resort each must be able to give *some* account of itself before the bar of Reason, some *rationale* of its aims and ideas.

Hence, though widely differing from Mr. Leslie Stephen on many points, we recognize the advantage and propriety of his method in placing a philosophical summary in the forefront of his *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, and we can cordially agree with him when he says that 'history divorced from philosophy leads in the first instance only to crude results' (vol. i., p. 57), and that 'when hard experience has proved a philosophy to be sterile, a religious movement founded upon it suffers from deeply-seated delicacy of constitution' (*ibid.* p. 33). Without philosophy, history or, to use a wider term, science, is really without method. It is vain to cry, as some do, facts are everything: give us facts. For philosophy alone can supply the guiding lines or regulative ideas without which both history and physical science would present only a congeries of mere facts, *rudis indigestaque moles.*

Regulative ideas, as philosophy itself teaches, play an important part in human life. It would be conducive to a more tolerant spirit than at present exists between honest and earnest workers in the two great departments of religion and science if the fact were more clearly recognized that some most cherished conceptions are regulative ideas, which are indeed reflections of truth, but of necessity conditioned by the limited nature of our faculties.[1] In regard to science,

[1] A remark is needed in order to prevent misunderstanding on an important point. The knowledge of God—not only *that* He is, but, in a measure, *what* He is—is attainable by man: not, indeed, by the understanding alone, nor by the reason alone, but by the co-operation of both with the Conscience or Moral Sense. This knowledge may be lost by men's own fault (Rom. i. 18 *seq.*), is recovered and developed in the Christian (1 S. John v. 20). Yet in the present life no man ever fully knows God *as* He is. Present knowledge, in comparison with what is promised hereafter, is like the 'childish things' which are 'put away' in manhood.

Digitized by Google

there seems, in our day, especial need for insisting on the fact. A leading idea of science is the discovery of mechanical connections between phenomena. Science is within her rights so long as she is steadily, and without undue haste, following this guiding line in her investigation of the order of the universe. But she exceeds her rights if she asserts that the universe as a whole, all the relations between its parts, and the volition and action of living beings, are mere results and examples of mechanical action.

Before discussing in detail any of the subordinate questions suggested by the books named at the head of this article, a somewhat closer consideration appears to be required of the question whether philosophy is possible, and, if so, whether it is useful.

The answer to the first part of the question depends entirely upon what philosophy is expected to be. If the philosopher be required to present a solid body of truth in a form as cogent as that of mathematical demonstration; a connected account of realities against which in detail no plausible objection can be urged: it must be admitted that, in this sense, philosophy is impossible. But in another sense it is not impossible. Its possibility is proved by the fact that it exists. For, as a matter of fact, all men who attempt to probe their knowledge or opinions to the bottom philosophize. It matters not what a man's final conclusion may be with regard to knowledge: the process by which that conclusion is arrived at is a more or less consistent philosophy. It is an attempt to look at knowledge as a whole. As soon as the teacher proceeds to offer his view of knowledge for acceptance by other minds he must, whether explicitly or not, employ the aid of what seems a true philosophy.

Philosophy is sometimes called the Science of Knowledge, and, no doubt, to become this is one of its aims.[1] But the definition is a little misleading, since it implies that philosophy has already attained its final goal, whereas it is still grappling with 'the one question with which philosophy, as such, is ever concerned—the relation of the individual subject to the universe of existence.'[2] There is some truth in the following remarks by Mr. Pattison, though they err in offering *too* low an estimate of the legitimate pretensions of philosophy:—

'The highest phase of the philosophical imagination is tentative,

[1] It is necessary to be thus guarded. For there are various opinions about the ground which philosophy really covers as its own peculiar territory; nor is there agreement as to what is knowledge.

[2] *Shaw Fellowship Lectures*, Adamson, p. 17.

Digitized by Google

not dogmatic. Philosophy cannot be presented as a system of truths for defence or proof. It offers considerations for meditation, and not fixed verities. It is an attempt to elevate the whole mind towards the contemplation of the *phenomena* of the world from their ideal side.'[1]

These remarks might well describe what may be called the lifelong philosophy of the individual. For the perception of the 'true' by finite conscious beings is a continual life and growth, and, notwithstanding what has been said above, is more cogent to the advancing mind than mathematics (*in se*), because, in point of fact, the perception of the true precedes mathematical discernment and becomes identical with it in the department of science.

But a *system* of philosophy intended for the help and guidance of others must include a theory of knowledge in the widest sense, that is to say of experience, and the best theory will be that which fits in the best with all the facts of experience. The question whether any given system tallies with experience is one that admits of argument on both sides, that is, of defence and of attack. But there is a point of difference to be remarked here between a philosophical system and a science. The latter, positing at the outset its axiomatic principles, must so put together every portion of its subsequent construction, that each part and each connecting link will bear the closest scrutiny. The former will base its claim to acceptance chiefly on the ground that, as a whole, it fairly recognizes the essential facts of experience, the difficulties of thought included, and gives a fairly satisfactory account of them.

In the light of this pretension philosophy makes good its claim to be possible; and if it is the case that, as a result of philosophical labours, a deeper glance is, from time to time, rendered possible into the relation of the individual to the universe, it follows that those labours are far from being fruitless. A review of the history of philosophy would establish this point beyond question. Indeed it will scarcely be denied that such progress has been effected, even if slowly and fitfully, in past times down to and including the time of Kant, or even, according to some teachers, down to our own time, though now the last word, we are told, has been said by Mr. Herbert Spencer. We are again in agreement with Mr. Leslie Stephen when he says that: '. . . More careful observation may show that each great man has contributed

[1] *Pope's Essay on Man.* Introduction. By Mark Pattison, B.D. Oxford, 1875.

Digitized by Google

some permanent element of truth, and that there is thus a continuous though a very tortuous advance in speculation.'[1]

II.

In a former number of this review[2] we noticed briefly Mr. Balfour's 'Defence of Philosophic Doubt,' but the unusual vigour and originality of the work invite a more particular notice of some of its defects and merits than was there given. From a literary point of view, the essay, as it is modestly styled by its author, deserves high commendation as a singularly lucid and able exposition of his views. It consists of a series of powerful and sometimes destructive attacks upon the supposed logical deductions of modern science. From the religious standpoint there might be little reason to find fault with the general conclusion to which Mr. Balfour leads, viz., that, whereas science has no means of logically justifying either its fundamental premisses or many of its inferences from them, it is in no better and no worse position than religion; and consequently that religion and science have equal claims to be treated with respect as the results of natural impulses. Still the conclusion will be hardly satisfactory to the *whole* man: for there is another impulse equally natural, the impulse to which a reasonable being must submit (and even sceptical reasoning proves its author to be reasonable), which urges him to seek for a uniting and harmonizing principle, or at least for the *pis aller* of such a conception of his relation to the universe as may account for his inability to solve the apparent inconsistencies of his mental position. Had fuller justice been done to this consideration, and had the more restricted pretensions of philosophy previously mentioned been duly recognized, it is possible that a different complexion would have been given to portions of Mr. Balfour's book. Indeed, it may yet be that the world will owe to the same powerful writer an orderly presentation of the affirmative side of his philosophy. That such a side exists we may infer from his confession that the business of philosophy is not to account for ultimate axioms nor to prove them, but to disengage them, to distinguish the real ultimate from the apparent and to exhibit them in systematic order.[3]

We proceed to notice some details of the work before us. The line of inquiry which Mr. Balfour has marked out for himself, viz., whether the vast system of modern science con-

[1] *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. p. 3.
[2] *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1880, p. 521.
[3] *Defence of Philosophic Doubt*, p. 8.

Digitized by Google

forms to the standard of formal logic, brings him at the outset face to face with Mill's doctrine of inference, which fares very badly at his hands. Thus he points out that, whereas Mill declares all inference to be from particulars, (1), the whole of our morality must be deduced from general principles which are not and cannot be themselves inferences from particulars, and, (2), in the application, according to Mill, of the system of inference from particulars the Law of Universal Causation really furnishes the major premiss. From the latter consideration it follows that, apart from mathematical truths, Mill's universal type of reasoning is scarcely called into requisition except to prove the Law of Universal Causation itself. Then he shows that it is impossible to prove this law from particulars, and that in fact Mill's attempt to do so assumes the very point in question.

Turning to the creed of science Mr. Balfour raises formidable difficulties in regard to the mere *application* of the Law of Universal Causation, supposing the law itself granted. 'For how,' he asks, 'can Mill's "method of difference" or his "method of agreement" be applied?' How in any case can all the possible co-operating causes be eliminated? The states of the universe are never the same at two successive instants, in all particulars save one, and never different in all particulars save one.

Again he shows most clearly that, regarded in reference to mere logic, knowledge of the past or future professed by physical science, and knowledge of the past professed by history, are not trustworthy. His argument is based on the mutual dependence of facts and laws. Laws of nature, for instance, are an essential part of the inference by which we arrive at facts, and yet the facts themselves are necessary stepping-stones to the knowledge of the laws.[1]

Mr. Balfour does not pretend to have invalidated the great body of scientific inferences, in which, indeed, he is as firm a believer as anyone; but he has certainly shown that we require

[1] This argument, however, is only valid when the laws are all taken together as one body and the facts all together as another body of supposed knowledge; and when, further, we are not allowed to assume that Nature with its connectedness of *phenomena* is adapted to our understanding with its category of causality, &c. A similar piece of sophistry meets us in the oft-repeated sneer of Matthew Tindal the deist: 'It's an odd jumble to prove the truth of a book by the truth of the doctrines it contains, and at the same time to conclude those doctrines to be true because contained in that book.' Just so, it might be an odd jumble to infer from our knowledge of a man's affection towards us that certain actions of his were dictated by benevolence, and to infer his benevolence from his kind actions.

Digitized by Google

a consistent *rationale* both of the basis of scientific construction and of the principles which rule its development. Such a *rationale* is really to be found in the Kantian principle of the Intelligibility of Nature, which in fact is the principle tacitly assumed by science. But it did not suit the negative character of Mr. Balfour's book to introduce this positive principle, which after all cannot be scientifically proved. Isolated from this general assumption, the related but subordinate principles of the uniformity of Nature and the simplicity of Nature are easily disposed of, Mr. Balfour remarking, as one of the objections to the latter principle, that if it were taken to mean that the laws of Nature are simple relatively to our faculties or easily understood, there would be involved 'a pre-established harmony between the cosmos and the microcosmos which men of science, at least, would be slow to admit.'[1]

The principle of the Intelligibility of Nature, or that Nature is adapted to our faculties of cognition, is not the same thing as that version of the doctrine that the '*esse*' is '*intelligi*,' of which Mr. Balfour furnishes a *reductio ad absurdum*. If nothing *is* but what is understood, *i.e.* seen in all its essential relations, then even supposing that a philosophical intellect has now attained to such understanding, there is no difficulty in showing that for the whole of the human race before the development of the Kantian system, for all who are now unable to grasp, or have not learnt those necessary relations, nothing—absolutely nothing—exists. It would, however, be rash to imagine that Kant, or the able expositors of his views who teach that the '*esse*' is '*intelligi*,' offered so glaring an absurdity to the destructive criticism of the first philosophical adventurer. The dictum must be taken with the qualification usually added, so that it runs, Nothing is for us *as thinking beings* but what is understood. And it must be viewed as in contrast with the fallacy, that sensation by itself can give the knowledge of an object apart from 'the relations which the mind, acting by its own laws, institutes between the several elements as it combines them into an object.'[2] The Kantian doctrine is that 'sensation does not refer *itself* to objects, but is only so referred by the understanding. If we were merely sensitive creatures a chaos of appearances would fill our minds, without giving rise to any distinct apprehension of objects, such as we mean by "experience."'[3]

[1] *Defence of Philosophic Doubt*, p. 64.
[2] Mansel's *Proleg. Log.* p. 228 (1851).
[3] *A Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant.* By Professor Caird, chapter iv.

Digitized by Google

Even in dealing with the so-called idealism of Berkeley, Mr. Balfour's criticism is not particularly successful, or only appears to succeed, because he leaves out of account the constructive side of the Bishop's theory. He is indeed perfectly candid and straightforward as to the omission, but it is not at all wonderful that the theory should collapse in consequence of it. A world of ideas without the Divine Mind as their cause is of course simply absurd.

But even apart from this mutilation of the theory, the thesis itself is by no means proved, that if the idealistic account of the universe be accurate, received science (by which *we* should understand not scientific assumptions but established scientific truth) cannot be true. It was possible, Mr. Balfour thinks, to hold the idealistic view when only objects, as known in common experience, were concerned, but impossible to reconcile with that view the far-reaching chemical and other scientific discoveries of recent times. Surely Berkeley would have replied that ideal atoms and ideal ether, within the range of our experience, as parts of an 'order,' may be just as useful or convenient for the production of the complex ideas, oxygen, carbon, and other 'elements,' as these are for the production of the infinitely varied combinations in what we call objects, and that a world so built up may be as effective in its result upon our consciousness as a world of substantial atoms is supposed to be,—nay, that, in point of fact, this world of ideas is the only world we can know.

Again, after quoting Berkeley's remark, 'the question whether the earth moves or no amounts in reality to no more than this, to wit . . . that if *we* were in a certain position we should perceive . . . motion,' Mr. Balfour proceeds to say that 'science tells us more . . . science tells us what would happen, or has happened, whether we or anybody else were there to perceive it or not.' With regard to this assertion it may be remarked, first, that science has not yet demonstrated the absence of that which is here professedly ignored, the Divine Mind; and secondly, that what Berkeley would probably say would be that science can only describe 'what has happened' in the terms of a possible perception, that is, in Berkeleian language, an idea.

When, however, Mr. Balfour goes on to say that science tells us that perceiving organisms were evolved from a world itself neither perceiving *nor perceived*, he is indeed formulating the fundamental tenet of materialism: but we should demur to being challenged to accept it in the majestic name of science. And so also, we think, would Mr. Balfour. For the

Digitized by Google

general drift of his book is decidedly hostile to the extravagant demands which are sometimes made in the name of science. Yet here he hurls an extreme scientific assumption as a destructive missile against idealism.[1]

The chapter on the 'Evolution of Belief'[2] is the one which will probably possess the greatest interest for the general reader at the present day. It is an able *reductio ad absurdum* of the extreme view of Evolution, bringing 'into clear consciousness' thoughts which, more or less vaguely, must have haunted the minds of many thinkers.

Wonderful indeed is the power, or the pretension, of Evolution! It has claimed to solve the mysteries of life, of organism, of intellect, of morals. All secrets in the earth, or out of it, were provided with the master key. All former conceptions of the universe as a whole; of the relations of living beings to the whole, and to one another; of the origin, nature, and destiny of man; were so much *pabulum* for its capacious maw. But the most striking of its achievements is yet untold. Having devoured everything else, it proceeds to devour itself. Carried to logical completion it will perform the Japanese ceremony of 'happy despatch.' For if everything has been mechanically evolved, beliefs have been so evolved. And Evolution is a process still going on. The solar system, all organisms, animal or vegetable, are undergoing change, rising, falling, disappearing. Beliefs are subject to the same law. They too have their 'exits and their entrances.' They have their rise, their culmination, their decay. What guarantee of stability, then, has the belief in Evolution more than other beliefs which have grown by mechanical laws? The moment that the theory is made quite complete, that is to say, universal and certain, is the moment of its own certain doom.

III.

From the proposition just laid down a corollary follows. On its own principles, Evolution cannot be employed as an infallible test to separate the true from the false. This remark is called for by the fact that it has been attempted to make this use of it. If a doctrine, whatever the apparent strength of its position in other respects, was adverse to the doctrine of Evolution, the fact has been held sufficient to con-

[1] For the concise statement of a really valid objection to Berkeley's idealism, see Mansel's *Prolegomena Logica*. Appendix, pp. 295, 296 (1851). Another fatal objection is the underlying fallacy, already referred to, that sensation, by itself, gives us the knowledge of objects.

[2] *Defence of Philosophic Doubt*, chapter xiii.

Digitized by Google

demn it. We may admire the hardihood implied in formulating such a principle. Our admiration is not lessened when we find mathematical axioms submitted to the test and found wanting. Yet this is the ground on which the late Professor Clifford rejected their universality and necessity. He admits the unsatisfactoriness of previous attempts to explain away the *à-priority* of mathematical truth.[1] He admits that Mill does not furnish an adequate answer to Whewell and Kant. Whewell contends that the axioms could not be known by experience;[2] to which Mill replies that even the imaginary pictures with the aid of which, by mere thinking, we satisfy ourselves of certain mathematical truths (as by thinking of two straight lines we satisfy ourselves that they cannot enclose a space) derive their value from the fact that they are known to exactly resemble real lines. We know, therefore, Mill continues, 'that we may conclude from them to real ones with quite as much certainty as we could conclude from one real line to another. The conclusion, therefore, is still an induction from observation.' Experience, in fact, is the source and the ground of our conclusions, even with regard to lines prolonged to infinity, as that 'two given lines never meet.' For if they do meet, this must take place at a finite distance; and if we imagine ourselves transported thither, we know by past experience that we should have upon our senses the impression of a 'bent' line or lines, and not of two straight lines. To Mill's argument Professor Clifford objects that, 'in admitting the universality of certain statements, Mr. Mill knows something which, on his own principles, he has no right to know'—which is a perfectly valid objection.

Again, when experience is taken, as it is now becoming the fashion to take it, as that 'not merely of the individual, but of all his ancestors,' human and non-human, 'stored and registered in his brain,' Professor Clifford, though accepting this view, does not see how, by such experience, 'accumulated for a hundred and fifty million years,' he could acquire the knowledge of a universal truth, *e.g.* that the angles of a [rectilineal] triangle are exactly equal to two right angles under all possible circumstances. The difficulty here asserted we have no desire to dispute, nor the dilemma which he bases upon it. 'Either I have some source of knowledge other than experience, ... or I cannot know that any universal statement is true.' The first alternative, however, is to be

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. i. p. 274 *seq.*

[2] This is not to contend that they could be known *without* experience.

Digitized by Google

preferred to the second, if for no other reason, because so acute a mind as Professor Clifford's was reduced in the last resort to encounter it with the doctrine of Evolution, which 'itself,' he says, 'forbids me to admit any transcendental source of knowledge.'[1] For this doctrine, as we have seen above, when carried to the extreme, is logically untenable, because actually suicidal; and it is only in the extreme form that it can possibly dictate absolutely with regard to the conditions or sources of knowledge.

Nor is this all. The supposed objection to the certainty of mathematical truth admits of being turned quite round. This certainty itself, if accepted, forbids me to accept the extreme form of the doctrine of Evolution.

What, however, is intended by the certainty and necessity of mathematical truth? A word is necessary on this point, or we may seem to be contending for a really untenable proposition. There is a confusion of thought not uncommon with writers who seek to employ Kantian principles for the support of practical conclusions very different to those of Kant. Into this confusion Professor Clifford appears to have fallen. Thus he adopts the Kantian view with regard to time and space, that they are necessary *forms* of perception, having only a phenomenal reality. He proceeds, however, none the less to deal with space as if it were real, and endeavours to show that its qualities may be so different, beyond the range of our experience, from what we suppose, that two straight lines of sufficient length may enclose a space, and that the angles of a rectilineal triangle need not be always equal to two right angles. The Kantian theory, according to him, gets rid of general statements. 'It makes them,' he says, 'into particular statements . . . . about *me*, and about other men.' This is surely a startling paradox. The statements in question are admitted to be universal as regards the *subject* who thinks; and, if we admit the ideal view, we acknowledge that we cannot investigate the properties of any reality that may underlie the space we know, while we must admit, also, that the same mental law which imposes the conception of space upon all our perceptions of and thoughts of objects imposes also the necessity of thinking those relations or properties of space which are formulated in mathematics.[2]

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. i. p. 281.

[2] On this point see *Prolegomena Logica*, by H. L. Mansel, p. 102 (1851), from which we quote a sentence :—'To imagine a space in which such properties are not found, would not be to imagine merely a different combination of sensible phenomena, such as continually takes place

Digitized by Google

In point of fact, our mathematical reasonings are primarily concerned with ideal, invisible objects, and only so far with perceived lines, forms, &c. as the latter approximate to the former. We reason about straight lines, right angles, circles, &c., but no perfect examples of such things, perceivable by sense, exist. Our mathematical truths are universal and necessary with regard to the former, but with regard to the examples, true so far only as they are capable of application. It is absolutely certain that two straight lines, as conceived by the mind, of any length whatsoever, cannot enclose a space. But we cannot say the same of any objective lines, supposed straight on the strength of sense-perception. A line from Sirius to my eye, *i.e.* the line by which light has travelled, may, for aught I know, not be really straight; but, *if it be so*, I am absolutely certain that no other straight line will, with it, enclose a space, to whatever extent they may be produced. We may admit that knowledge, if it were attainable, of the reality underlying what we call space might relieve us from the sense of the 'dreary infinities;' but by accepting the Kantian doctrine we confess that such knowledge is out of our reach. But this same confession does relieve us from the distracting 'Antinomy,' which, if we regarded space as real, would compel us to think that it must either be finite or infinite, and yet would not allow us to rest in either conclusion. The new mathematical theory expounded by Professor Clifford aims at relief by attempting to show that space—the space we know—may be finite: that an imaginary straight line is really a bent line, and consequently, if sufficiently prolonged, will eventually return to the same point.

We have seen that, by Professor Clifford's own acknowledgment, the doctrine of Evolution must have had some influence in inducing him to accept these paradoxical views with regard to space and the science of space. The same acknowledgment supplies the key to other portions of his teaching, which will seem not less paradoxical to many persons. He was not one who was content to rest in Agnosticism. He was by no means prepared to accept 'the conclusion to which philosophers were led, ... that on every side, when we approach the limits of existence, a contradiction must stare us in the face.'[1] On the contrary, he boldly defies the difficulties of thought, and endeavours 'to

without any change in the laws of sensibility; it would be to imagine myself as perceiving under conditions other than those to which, by a law of my being, I am subjected.'

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. i. p. 152.

Digitized by Google

show that in these cases of supposed contradiction there is always something which we do not know now, but of which we cannot be sure that we shall be ignorant next year.'[1] But the knowledge with which he starts is prodigious. Thus he knows that 'mind without brain is a contradiction,'[2] and he knows enough about the physical world to say that it is 'made of atoms and ether, and there is no room in it for ghosts:'[3] whence it necessarily follows that no purely spiritual being exists. Atoms and ether, then, constitute the sum of things. But now the question presented itself, how to get out of these materials such things as sensibility, mind, consciousness, personality. By Evolution. From the same inexhaustible conjuror's treasury morality and religion could be got by Evolution. Evolution could explain everything, and because it professed to elicit all these results from atoms and ether, no other source could be admitted for a moment. Evolution is, in fact, the god of this new world:—

'Nil majus generatur ipso
Cui nihil viget simile aut secundum.'

Before noticing, however, the peculiarities of the late Professor's constructive theory of the world, we must claim a moment's attention to a point of some importance, which he felt it necessary to deal with at the outset. There is a certain 'unity of consciousness' which cannot be altogether denied to exist, and which, unless explained away, is a most formidable stumbling-block to the 'atomic' theory of consciousness. How does the materialist deal with this? Professor Clifford denied any *fundamental* unity to consciousness at all. 'The fundamental deliverance of consciousness affirms its own complexity.'[4] This, however, is only his private interpretation of the undoubted fact, that multitudinous and diverse objects simultaneously solicit the attention of the mind. We have a similar experience with regard to any separate faculty, as that of vision. But he was compelled to admit *some* unity: the unity which he calls, in the language of Kantian philosophers, the 'unity of apperception,' and which they illustrate by the statement that the formula 'I think' must (*in posse*) accompany all perceptions,[5] &c. 'This unity,' Professor Clifford says, 'does not consist in the instantaneous consciousness which it unites, but only in subsequent reflection

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. i. p. 153. [2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 66.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 67. [4] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. ii. p. 79.
[5] 'An idea, which I could not relate to the same self, I could not be conscious of as my idea; *i.e.*, I could not be conscious of it at all.' Professor Caird, *Philosophy of Kant*, chapter viii.

Digitized by Google

upon it; it consists in the power of establishing a certain connection between the memories of any two feelings which we had at the same instant.'[1] The wording of this definition is ambiguous, but taken with the context it seems to assert that whatever personal identity we have consists in memory. The fallacy here arises from confounding two different things, personal identity and that which gives us the assurance of it. I am certified, on reflecting upon events ten or twenty years back, or as far back as remembrance can reach, that I am the same person who did or suffered such and such things; but this reflection does not *constitute* my personal identity. For, as Bishop Butler aptly remarks, 'one should really think it self-evident, that consciousness of personal identity presupposes, and therefore cannot constitute, personal identity.'[2]

Let us now see how out of 'atoms' Professor Clifford got sensation, consciousness, &c. It was at first sight a difficult enterprise, but it must be admitted that he succeeded. How, then, was this success obtained? By a contrivance precisely similar to that by means of which the prestidigitator often obtains from an apparently empty bag eggs, pigeons, &c. By the simple process of putting them in beforehand. If 'atoms' are first endowed with 'elements' of feeling, and if a living being is nothing but a complex of feeling, it is a plausible theory that a certain combination of atoms may think and speak, and love and hate, and call itself a man. But let the doctrine be enunciated in its author's own words.

'The element of which even the simplest feeling is a complex, I shall call mind-stuff. A moving molecule of inorganic matter does not possess mind or consciousness; but it possesses a small piece of mind-stuff. . . . When matter takes the complex form of a living human brain the corresponding mind-stuff takes the form of a human consciousness, having intelligence and volition.'[3]

Such a theory might be sufficiently discredited by the fact that it has been formulated under the dire pressure of neces-

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. ii. p. 80.

[2] *Analogy*, Dissertation I. 'Of Personal Identity.' See also Thos. Brown's *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Mind*, pp. 376, 377 (19th edition, 1851), and Reid's *Essays on the Intellectual Powers*, Essay III. chapter vi. The doctrine that memory constitutes personal identity was maintained by Locke. Hamilton in a note quotes a remark of Reid's to the effect that Locke on his own principles could not have been born, since he could not have remembered the fact. The modern maintainers of Locke's view would not be moved by this argument, nor perhaps would they be staggered by the inference that a boy who had grown to manhood and had forgotten the acts of the boy, was no longer the same person.

[3] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. ii. p. 85.

Digitized by Google

sity. On materialist grounds there was no other possible method of accounting for mental facts. These could not possibly be got out of material atoms unless they were first imagined to exist (*in posse*) in them. But if we are to believe that molecules, say of stone, or of water, possess elements of mind, we require some more cogent evidence than the patent fact that such a belief is required in support of a theory. The only thing thus proved is the inherent weakness of the theory that required such support.

But the most remarkable feature of Professor Clifford's philosophy has yet to be noticed. So far we find that the universe, according to him, consists of matter that is mind-stuff *plus* matter that is not mind-stuff. He was not contented to rest in this conclusion but must go deeper still. Philosophers who follow Kant confess that the knowledge of things-in-themselves is out of our reach. Professor Clifford, however, discovered a royal road even to this knowledge. It is to be got at by simple proportion, and the final result which we obtain is that the thing-in-itself, the reality underlying phenomena, is itself mind-stuff. What then, we ask, is the other portion of matter: that, viz., which is *not* mind-stuff? This is incidentally declared to be 'mental image,' 'perception in my mind.' After all, then, nothing exists but perceiving mind (made up of mind-stuff, of course), and mind-stuff not indeed itself perceived, but somehow corresponding to 'mental images.'[1] It is difficult to see how this doctrine is to be

[1] This will be clear upon an attentive perusal of Professor Clifford's argument, which we give. The italics are his, the explanatory parentheses are ours.

'Suppose that I see a man looking at a candlestick. Both of these are objects, or phenomena in my mind. An *image* of the candlestick, in the optical sense, is formed upon his retina and nerve-messages go from all parts of this to form what we may call a *cerebral image* somewhere . . . in his brain. This cerebral image is a certain complex of disturbances in the matter of these organs (the optic thalami, &c.); it is a material or physical fact, therefore a group of my possible sensations, just as the candlestick is. The cerebral image is an imperfect representation of the candlestick, corresponding to it point for point in a certain way. Both the candlestick and the cerebral image are matter; but one material complex *represents* the other material complex in an imperfect way. Now the candlestick is not the external reality whose existence is represented in the man's mind; for the candlestick is a mere perception in *my* mind (a 'mental image' of mine). Nor is the cerebral image the man's perception of the candlestick; for the cerebral image is merely an idea of a possible perception in my mind (a possible 'mental image' of mine). But there *is* a perception in the man's mind which we may call the *mental image*; and this corresponds to some external reality. *The external reality* (*i.e.* the thing-in-itself) *bears the same relation to the mental image* (the man's) *that the phenomenal candlestick* (my mental image) *bears*

Digitized by Google

reconciled with that enunciated in the paragraph quoted above from the same lecture.

Such, as we have seen, was the philosophical basis of Professor Clifford's teaching. A cursory examination has shown it to be confused and inconsistent. After this it is not necessary to follow him into the depths of his negation as regards the Moral Lawgiver and Divine Helper of men. A single remark here will suffice. Such a phenomenon as Nihilism is a practical refutation of the theory that social life carries its own necessary and safe guarantee of social order and morality.

IV.

It is a relief to turn from a crude and one-sided theory of the universe to the consistent system elaborated by the great German philosopher of the last century. Emmanuel Kant was born in the year 1724. Forty-six years later, in an inaugural address as professor of philosophy, he promulgated the leading thought of his system. But it was not until after ten years more of labour that the Critical Philosophy was fully developed, which has consequently been before the world for exactly a century.

It is not perhaps an uncommon case for a man's work to be received with warm appreciation on its first appearance, then to be discredited, and afterwards to emerge into higher estimation than before. Our own Shakespeare's reputation has passed through just such an experience. This has been the case with regard to Kant. His system of philosophy, though its doctrines were startlingly novel and couched in novel phraseology, commanded during its author's lifetime a wide though not a universal acceptance. Subsequently, in consequence, partly, of attacks directed upon it from opposing systems, partly, of the extravagant doctrines which his principles were strained into supporting, Kant's fame experienced a partial eclipse. At the present time, however, there is a wider and perhaps deeper appreciation of the value of his labours than at any previous period. In fact, it would be no exaggeration to call Kant the intellectual ruler in the present world of thought. Leaders of very different schools bow to his supre-

to the cerebral image (a possible mental image of mine). Now the candlestick (my mental image) and the cerebral image (my possible mental image) are both matter. They are made of the same stuff. Therefore the external reality is made of the same stuff as the man's perception or mental image, that is, it is made of mind-stuff' (p. 85). But why in the world is *my* mental image matter, whereas the *man's* mental image is made of mind-stuff?

Digitized by Google

macy, and adopt as fundamental elements of their system principles which he was the first to formulate.

The exponents of the Kantian system usually begin with the simplest elements of knowledge, and show that a single object, as known, presupposes certain principles or 'forms' of determination, which are the furniture or the actual constituents of the Understanding. Hence by a gradual ascent we are taken to the region of the three great 'ideas'—the World, the Soul, and God—for which sense-experience, and understanding, furnish no determinations, unless it be by way of analogy. Thus we arrive at the supreme (psychological) conception of Reason as pointing to and demanding a reality, a unity, a harmony, to which Understanding with its forms of finite thought cannot attain: at the conception of the Practical Reason with its Categorical Imperative of Duty, demanding that there shall be, even though the mode of such a thing remain undefinable and undemonstrable, a possibility of realizing Freedom in a world where sense and understanding may only find mechanical or necessary connexion.

Instead of following the details of this line of ascent we will strike into it at the point where one of those difficulties of thought comes into view, which are insoluble to the understanding, but before which we cannot be contented to stand with folded arms merely confessing their insolubility. We require to form some conception of our intellectual being as a whole, and of the powers of our understanding, which will at least help us to answer why it is that we must ask certain questions, and why it is that we cannot answer them. The Kantian conception may, in regard to some details, admit of enlarging or of reducing. But, on the whole, that conception does harmonize with experience, and furnishes repose for thought to an extent to which no alien system can pretend.

A familiar difficulty, and one that is freely employed in opposition to theistic belief, is that with regard to the idea of Causation when applied to the world as a whole. The ground may be cleared at the outset by the assertion that a belief in Causation, as universally applicable to natural phenomena, is held more or less consciously by all men. Much futile talk has been expended in contravening this assertion. Of any occurrence whatever everyone in his senses really believes that either the will of a living being or some antecedent phenomenon has been the means of bringing it about. It is, however, quite true that not everyone knows that he believes in the universal law, since not everyone is sufficiently expert in self-examination to detect all his own beliefs. It is,

Digitized by Google

therefore, no refutation of our assertion to cite any number of intelligent witnesses who are not certain as to the truth of the abstract proposition that every event has a cause.

Can any instance of a sane human being be produced who believed that a given event was absolutely uncaused? The most ignorant woman who, on returning to her cottage after a short absence, should find that the day's dinner had vanished from the table, would be quite certain that there must have been some cause for its disappearance.

The principle of Causation, then, as Kant teaches and we affirm, is in one respect the expression of a universal law of the human understanding, while objectively it is a universal element of phenomena regarded in relation to one another. Can we apply it to the world as a whole? Practically the religious believer is justified in referring the whole to the operation of the 'Great First Cause.' This, however, is only one out of many instances in which words may, perhaps must, be employed in religion which can only partially, or only by way of analogy, express the truth. Philosophical criticism has no difficulty in demonstrating that the expression is not strictly satisfactory. Hume and his latest expositor can make an easy show of demolishing theism by attacking the phrase. It is matter of regret that Hume's sceptical arguments should be distributed far and wide without anything in the shape of an antidote to them; but, regarded as verbal criticism, Hume's objections to the phrase, and the following argument given by Professor Huxley, are perfectly valid.

'Suppose Y to be the imagined first cause, and Z to be its effect. Let the letters of the alphabet, *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, in their order, represent successive moments of time, and let *g* represent the particular moment at which the effect Z makes its appearance. It follows that the cause Y could not have existed "in its full perfection" during the time *a*—*e*, for if it had, then the effect Z would have come into existence during that time, which, by the hypothesis, it did not do. The cause Y, therefore, must have come into existence at *F*, and if "everything that comes into existence has a cause," Y must have had a cause X operating at *e*; X, a cause W operating at *d*; and so on, *ad infinitum*.' [1]

Now all this amounts to saying, what indeed cannot be denied, that unless the word cause is used in two senses, a 'first cause' can only mean the first of a series of causes, with a character of causality not differing in kind from that of other members of the series. As such it must require what each of them requires, namely, a cause of its own existence. Though

[1] *Hume*, by Professor Huxley, p. 149.

Digitized by Google

a cause in one direction, it must be an effect in another. The phrase therefore involves a contradiction in terms. This confusion arises from taking the language that is only suited for expressing mutual relations of phenomena, which by a law of our mental being must be thought under the conditions of time, or time and space, and applying that language to express the relation of the phenomenal world to the unconditioned. It is seen how important a part time-determination plays in the above quotation. If we accept the Kantian view of time, the whole pretension that theology is demolished by exposure of the literal impropriety of the phrase in question falls to the ground.

There is, however, another objection to the phrase. If it were not inconsistent, still it is inadequate. It furnishes no explanation of the ground of causation itself. We are familiar with the phenomenon of a certain cause being followed by, or (as we say) producing, a certain effect. Mr. Balfour, indeed, shows that unless we assume the principle of Universal Causation, and, perhaps, not even when that is assumed, can we *logically* prove that the same causes always produce the same effects. Waiving, however, any speculative question of this kind, and assuming what, indeed, we all believe, that they do so, we are still at a loss to know *why* they do so. Between two phenomena regarded as cause and effect—as the application of heat and the boiling of water—science may trace certain intermediate phenomena each in turn an effect and a cause; but in regard to each, science is incompetent to answer the question why it produces the effect. And this scientific incompetence is even more glaring when the relation between physical and psychical phenomena is under consideration. So deeply is this felt that, in order to escape from the difficulty (which is confessed here, though it is sometimes ignored when physical causes and effects alone are in question), some teachers go so far as to doubt and even to deny any causal relation between the psychical and the physical. Thus Professor Huxley says, 'We do not know and cannot know that volition does cause corporeal motion; while there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view that it is no cause, but merely a concomitant of that motion.'[1] Professor Clifford less hesitatingly, 'The physical world gets along entirely by itself.' The psychical then is not in causal relation to the physical. To be consistent we must doubt or deny the physical to be in causal relation to the psychical. Changes in the material

[1] *Hume*, p. 128.

Digitized by Google

world cannot be causes of changes in consciousness. Neither the vibration, for instance, of a luminiferous ether, nor any other physical fact, is the cause of my seeing. The two facts simply accompany each other, in accordance, we suppose, with some law of pre-established harmony, which however is about the last thing that modern science would grant.[1]

The fact is that whether in regard to the relation between matter and mind, or between phenomena in either sphere, there is an inscrutable element in the simplest connection of cause and effect. We may discover, as it is the aim of science to discover, what causes produce what effects. But the 'causa causans' remains unknown. It is beyond the grasp of science; there is no 'category' of the understanding for its determination; but it is a postulate of Reason. Thus in exchange for the conception of a 'first cause' (which conception cannot account for the world as a whole, nor for the mutual relation of its parts, because a first cause must be, if the words are taken literally, only one of a series of phenomena), we have the idea to which reason points of the self-determined *ground* of the whole, including the causal relation itself, and this is God.[2]

So far we are restricted to the acknowledgment of the *idea* of God, an idea which is useful as regulative of knowledge, but which, according to the Kantian school, no cognition of the phenomenal world can determine as having objective existence. At the same time no cognition of the phenomenal world can disprove its objective reality. To quote the words of Professor Adamson:—

'It is demonstrated that these categories' (of the understanding, *scil.*) 'have applicability only to the conditioned, and that no argument based on them, can apply either way (either positively or negatively) to the unconditioned. If from other sources indications

[1] The difficulty as regards the relation between mind and matter is no new one, as may be seen from the following sentences quoted by Professor Adamson from Geulincx, an early follower of Descartes. Geulincx died in 1669.

'Igitur in mundo nil quicquam agimus, spectamus eum duntaxat, verum illud spectare rursus admirabili modo contingit, nam mundus non potest se ipsum ut spectetur adhibere, nec speciem suam nobis ingerere, est in se ipso invisibilis. Quemadmodum non operamur in id, quod extra nos est, ita, quod extra est non operatur in nos' (*Ethica*, p. 122). 'Nec motus sequitur in membris meis voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem meam comitatur' (p. 124).—*Shaw Fellowship Lectures*, p. 198.

[2] It may be said, and truly said, in defence of the phrase on which we have been commenting, that the idea of 'first link in a chain' is *not* the ultimate Christian idea of Causation. But this is the idea commonly entertained, even among persons fairly educated.

Digitized by Google

of an unconditioned are obtained or obtainable, the field is left open for them.'[1]

We shall not now discuss the question whether a more affirmative aspect might not have been given on purely philosophical grounds to Kant's conclusion: though much might be said, especially in connection with Kant's view of the unreality (in the absolute sense) and mere contingency of phenomena, on the compelling force with which the idea presents itself of the self-existent necessary Being. The theist, however, if hard pressed, may be contented with that conclusion as it stands. He will, however, go on to affirm with Kant, that the conception of the moral law furnished by the practical reason supplies the positive element that is required. In the eloquent words of Professor Caird:—

'If the absolute law of our moral life postulates the existence of God as an absolute intelligence, then the pure Ideal of Reason, the conception which includes and crowns all human knowledge, will be shown to be objectively real; and Criticism which silences the voice of speculative reason will have precluded every objection on its part.'[2]

This view is not inconsistent with the Biblical doctrine that God, the one only Good, the Moral Governor, 'rewarder of them that diligently seek Him,' is an Object apprehended by 'faith,' not seen either by the bodily eyes or by that mental perception which is confined to the understanding, and is a mere product of demonstration.

According to the system of Kant, then, the understanding supplies or consists of principles which have validity, when applied consistently with the teachings of experience, to explain the mutual relations of phenomena. They give us what we call knowledge: or rather some elements of knowledge, for, to go no further, it is clear that these principles of the understanding by themselves cannot give us the knowledge of what the understanding itself is, and consequently could never have issued in the Critical Philosophy itself. Hence science is able to put together constructive demonstrations which have more of compelling force upon the understanding (understanding being taken in the limited sense as the faculty which supplies the notions of Quantity, etc.) in proportion as they approach the purely mathematical.

But it is only the phenomenal world that is within the ken of science, to be analysed, or weighed, or measured. Things-in-themselves cannot be determined by the under-

[1] *Shaw Fellowship Lectures*, p. 85. [2] *The Philosophy of Kant*, p. 637.

Digitized by Google

standing, whether in regard to quantity, quality, or relation. The attempt to apply the finite categories of the understanding, in order to describe things-in-themselves, or to explain the world as a whole, or to apprehend the meaning of eternity, or to establish the statement that one of the pair of assertions must be true, 'Space is finite,' 'Space is infinite,' or one of the pair, 'Matter is infinitely divisible,' 'Matter is not infinitely divisible:' this attempt springs from an illusion with regard to the powers of the understanding, and must be futile. This negative side of Kant's doctrine is now generally accepted. But at this point his followers diverge. Of these, if we leave out of account the visionary German metaphysicians who have had little influence on English thought, there are two main divisions. The one, resting entirely upon his negation and rejecting his doctrine of the Ideas of Reason, claims him as the parent of Agnosticism; while the other more consistently accepts his teaching as a whole, partly because the portion of it rejected by the former is seen to be logically bound up with the portion accepted, and partly because only as a whole does it take in experience as a whole.

Of the two works on Kant named in our list, Professor Caird's is a somewhat voluminous, though able account of the Critical Philosophy, preceded by a valuable historical introduction. The body of the work is interspersed, and perhaps a little overloaded with criticisms and additions. The second work is of much smaller compass, and though not a complete *résumé* of Kantian doctrine, is very useful as pointing out the inconsistencies of the Agnostic position. It is in the form of four lectures delivered in January, 1879, in the University of Edinburgh, and we must say that it speaks well for philosophical study in the northern capital, and is altogether a hopeful sign, if a body of students was forthcoming capable of following on four successive days, lectures so full of matter for thought as those of Professor Adamson.

II. 1.

Students of the movements of thought in the last century are assured that they can mark definite stages of the struggle between the assailants and the defenders of Revelation. They appraise the intellectual forces, and describe the *personnel* of either side: they define the ground on which the battle was fought, enumerate with Homeric detail its varying phases, and the part enacted by each doughty hero: assign the precise moment when the fight began, and that when,

Digitized by Google

excepting the too late discharge of a piece or some isolated skirmish, it ended.

Important as were the issues raised, bearing as it seemed upon the life of the Church and the existence of Revealed Religion, yet the work of the Church went on, if somewhat sluggishly according to present ideas; and from the very bosom of the Church an energetic and wide-spreading religious movement, deriving its vital force from Revelation, was originated.

The nineteenth century has been marked by a battle of religion in which the interests at stake have been greater than those round which the contest raged in the eighteenth. Whether the forces on either side have exhibited an advance in strength comparable to that displayed in material warfare is a question on which different opinions might be maintained. It would be difficult, at any rate, to find the parallels of Berkeley and Butler on the one side, or of Hume on the other.

As before, however, the work of the Church has been going on meanwhile, and, as before, there has been a vast increase of religious activity, but in the present case, more directly connected in principle with the Church, though not without a stimulating effect beyond her borders.

In this kind of warfare it is not easy for contemporaries to distinguish the turning points or the decisive moment of the struggle, still less to predict its practical consequences. Yet there are not wanting indications that, so far as the logical encounter is concerned, the battle of the nineteenth century as to the existence of the supernatural has at least arrived at that stage when no new forces can be expected on either side. Whatever attempts are made on either side to repulse the other must probably be made merely by means of new arrangements of old forces. In plain words, the subject has been thoroughly discussed; and from the point of view of the intellectual world of our day it is not likely that any new arguments of importance will be invented.

Ten years ago the issue of the attack upon one of the chief fortresses of theism, the freedom of the human will, was seen by so able a reasoner as Professor Huxley to be, to all intents and purposes, a victory for the defenders:—

'Philosophers,' he says, 'gird themselves for battle upon the last and greatest of all speculative problems: Does human nature possess any free, volitional, or truly anthropomorphic element, or, is it only the cunningest of all Nature's clocks? Some, among whom I count myself, think that the battle will for ever remain a drawn one, and

Digitized by Google

that, for all practical purposes, this result is as good as anthropomorphism winning the day.'[1]

In the controversy of our time the deepest question involved has been whether Matter without God is the basis and origin of the universe, with its sidereal systems, with organic nature, with living and thinking beings: that is to say, whether any Supernatural at all exists. Notwithstanding some extravagant assertions and self-contradictory theories, the Materialists have not advanced one whit nearer to the proof of their dictum. The old difficulties remain. Individual atoms, as Lange says in reference to older theories, do not feel, or their feelings could not be fused together in a void space, which has no substratum, cannot conduct sensation, and still less partake of it. If we fall back on the solution, 'The motion of the atoms is sensation,' the difficulty remains the same. 'How can the motion of a body, in itself non-sentient, be sensation? Who is it, then, that feels? How does the sensation come about? Lucretius answers none of these questions.'[2] In his great work, 'The History of Materialism,' Lange never loses sight of the difficulties which he has signalized at the outset. The following passage offers a convenient summary of them:—

'We have repeatedly seen how difficult, how impossible even, it must ever be for Materialism, so far as it adopts the notion of atoms, to account for the *locality* of sensations, and, generally, for the facts of consciousness. Do they consist in the combination of atoms? Then they exist in an abstraction, and are, objectively speaking, nowhere. Are they in the motion? That would be the same thing. We only regard the moved atom itself as the seat of the sensation. How, then, does motion result in consciousness? In an individual atom, or, again, in abstractions, or in void space, which would then be no longer void, but filled with a strictly immaterial substance.'[3]

Materialism as an ultimate explanation of the universe must be ruled out of court. Supposing, however, that we were driven to the belief that finite consciousness cannot exist

[1] *Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews,* 'The Scientific Aspects of Positivism.' Macmillan, 1870.

[2] See *History of Materialism,* by Frederick Albert Lange, late Professor of Philosophy in the Universities of Zürich and Marburg, translated by Ernest Chester Thomas, 1877. Trübner, London. Vol. i. notes 1 and 13, and vols. i. and ii. *passim.* We have styled Lange's work 'great,' and it deserves the epithet, notwithstanding the singular illusion under which the author laboured, that the value of religious ideas can be maintained and religious institutions can be preserved, when the former shall have been seen to be mere poetry, destitute of substantial foundation.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 127.

Digitized by Google

apart from some form of matter,[1] the belief in Revelation and in a future life may well co-exist with such a position. It was abundantly shown by the authors of *The Unseen Universe*, that the received physical laws do not contradict, if they do not demand, both these beliefs: or, as Mr. Gladstone puts it:—

'If upon a materialistic basis we can have *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, the works of Aristotle, the *Divina Commedia*, the *Imitation of Christ*, the Gospels and Epistles, there may in the unseen world possibly be reared, on this same basis, all that theology has taught us.'[2]

But if Matter is not the basis and origin of things, then something that we can only call Mind must be: and this involves a recognition of purpose, of final end, in nature. When once this foundation is laid, much inevitably follows. Thus, if only universal facts in the human organism are the realization of an end, parts of a Divine purpose, the steps are easy which lead to the acceptance of Christian doctrine. Is it a divinely intended fact of the human organism that man shall feel himself compelled to pray?[3] Then the impulse to prayer can be no more delusive than any natural instinct of any species of living beings. Is it a divinely intended fact of the human organism that man shall seek and pray for spiritual guidance and help? Then it follows that Revelation has been given, and the means of spiritual help have been provided.

Accept Revelation, then, and it satisfies the divinely implanted hunger of man. It tells him that the Maker of all things is no far-off artificer, who has contrived a gigantic machine, which he has left to work by itself; but a Father in heaven, Who will hear His children's cry and will help them. We cannot see *how* prayer is answered consistently with the regularity of natural laws; but Revelation assures us of the fact that it is answered, and the difficulty of action *for* the individual may perhaps be solved, at least in part, by action *on* the individual.

II.

The two books at the end of our list form a considerable contribution to apologetic literature. The first is the

[1] Or, from the point of view of an Idealist, that 'matter is the necessary object of spirit.'

[2] *Gleanings of Past Years*, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. Vol. iii. p. 131 [1879].

[3] 'It is legitimate to call religion, in its most general sense, a universal phenomenon of humanity.' These words are quoted and approved by Professor Max Müller. *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, p. 79.

Digitized by Google

more philosophical, the second the more popular. The latter, it must be admitted, is logically and philosophically weak.

The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined is a posthumous work. Its author died in 1877, at the early age of forty-two, after holding for little more than a year the post of Professor of Philosophy and Church History in the Lancashire Independent College. In this work he has given such proof that he possessed remarkable powers of thought and of expression as to occasion regret for his premature decease in a wider sphere than that with which he was directly connected. The task of editing the book has been performed with care and fidelity by a colleague. From the Editor's Preface we learn that the manuscript had undergone no final revision on the author's part: a fact which sufficiently accounts for occasional unnecessary repetitions, and for the somewhat sudden termination of the book.

The drift of Mr. Herbert's well-reasoned and lucid argument is thus summarized by himself:—

'The whole argument of these pages goes to show that the character of phenomena points irresistibly to things not seen, necessary to account for them. Among others, the phenomena of religious thought and feeling point to this conclusion—suggest, compel, the *inference* of a Divine Being, accessible in prayer. But, as in other cases, this is an inference from phenomena respecting what lies behind them; God is not Himself a phenomenon. The inference respecting God rests . . . . upon the same basis as our inference respecting other conscious beings like ourselves; their minds are not phenomena, but are known to us only as inferences from them. It is maintained that the facts which lead us to believe in and seek fellowship with God are—like those which lead us to believe in and have fellowship with one another—simply phenomena, that is to say, certain mental states—sensational, intellectual, and emotional—which carry legitimate inferences respecting other conscious beings.' [1]

The philosophical point with which the author connects his argument is the same as that glanced at in our remarks on Professor Clifford's teaching: the assumption that science is competent to deal with *realities.* In the opening portion of his book Mr. Herbert exhibits the inconsistencies of some of the modern views on the connexion between mind and matter. The doctrines of Dr. Carpenter, Professors Bain, Huxley, and Clifford are examined and declared to be untenable; and it is shown that to physical science mental facts are absolutely non-existent. As we have already seen, some scientific authorities teach us in the plainest language that

[1] *Modern Realism,* pp. 363, 364.

Digitized by Google

consciousness is never the cause of physical change, that the course of events, and the actions of every individual, are purely mechanical. Mr. Herbert points out the full meaning of this teaching, not for the purpose of discrediting the conclusions of science *within the limits of phenomena*, but to show that the domain of science is limited. If consciousness is never the cause of physical change, then

'the actions, words and gestures of every individual of the human race would have been exactly what they have been, in the absence of mind. . . . The same empires would have risen and fallen, the same battles would have been fought and won, the same literature, the same masterpieces of painting and music, would have been produced, the same religious rites would have been performed, and the same indications of friendship and affection given. To this absurdity physical science stands committed.'[1]

Absurd as this conclusion is, Mr. Herbert argues with much force that, if it were not arrived at on other grounds, the denial of design in the material universe inevitably leads to it. He admits that

'the ever-accumulating stores of facts have gone to show that every physical effect has had physical antecedents adequate to produce it,' . . . . 'to show that nothing takes place in the universe of dead or living matter which is not the inevitable consequence of the surrounding physical conditions, so that it is wholly superfluous, and therefore illegitimate, to suppose that the feeblest impulse from without ever disturbs the balance of the physical situation.'[2]

He inverts the famous watch argument, and instead of proving that a plant or other work of nature shows as clear evidences of design as a watch, he proves that, on scientific principles, 'the mental fact, design,' has had as little to do with the production of the watch as of the plant.

'To physical science man is,' in fact, 'in the fullest sense, a part of nature, and all his works natural productions—as much as shells and clouds—effected by bodily movements, governed altogether by physical causes, and incapable of the slightest modification by his directing intelligence.'[3]

There is a further and important conclusion to which the author leads. We cannot forbear quoting almost *in extenso* the interesting passage in which it is set forth:—

'If the natural course of events is never interfered with by intelligence, there is no room at all for the exertions of human minds, but for creative design there is still abundant scope. . . . And it is quite open to us to suppose that this Infinite Intelligence was applied

[1] *Modern Realism*, p. 132. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 133, 135. [3] *Ibid.* p. 142.

Digitized by Google

beforehand in framing the universe instead of operating continuously afterwards; but no such supposition can be made respecting the mind of man, which emerges, or seems to emerge, amid the interminable iron meshes of physical causation, too late, if otherwise able, to fore-ordain that they shall produce watches or steam-engines, or anything at all, and incapable of diverting physical sequences by one hair's breadth from their original predestined course. It follows that all the watches and steam-engines . . . if products of intelligence at all, are, on the scientific view, results of the Creator's skill, in the same sense, and to the same extent, as flowers and butterflies, the universe of stars, and all the furniture of heaven and earth. Thus the scientific conclusion that Divine Intelligence never interferes with the natural course of events not only denies to the mind of man all power over them, but compels us to see in the so-called triumphs of his mind only the marks of original creative design, if design is acknowledged at all. This result is a precise reversal of the notion generally entertained. It is commonly supposed that physical science tends to banish Divine Intelligence from the universe, and to exalt the achievements of the mind of man. But, in fact, the very conclusion of science which denies Divine interference with the course of events, reduces the human intellect to an absolute cipher, and lays all its fancied triumphs at the feet of the Creator.'[1]

The thoughtful reader of Mr. Herbert's book will probably admit that he has refuted the pretensions of materialistic science to account for everything. Whether he will agree with the author's *dictum* that science should ignore all mental facts, or with his transcendental philosophy, is another question. It appears to us that science must have *something* to say about the undoubted parallelism that exists, to an unknown extent, between matter and mind, between brain-changes and facts of consciousness, and this being the case, since the mechanical relation of consciousness to the material world, of *psychosis* to *neurosis*, cannot be explained, the proper position for science is to admit her inability to define *all* the links in a series of sequences in the midst of which consciousness arises. In admitting that all human actions and all the arrangements of the universe can be explained as the result of mechanical laws, Mr. Herbert undoubtedly gains a commanding position, whence he may destroy by *reductio ad absurdum* any pretensions of materialistic science to describe things as they *really* are; but has he not admitted too much? Has he not, in fact, surrendered everything that he seems to be fighting for? He has left no room for free-will, for Divine answer to prayer, for Divine interference of any kind. He has landed us in a world which began in some manner that,

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 143 *seq.*

Digitized by Google

according to these views, ought to have been impossible, and which is moving on, if science speaks truly, to certain destruction. The admission that a mechanical explanation *can* be given for everything is the real flaw in the book.[1] For neither in regard to human action nor in regard to nature, is the circle of mechanical connections completely made out; and only by a mere leap in the dark—a totally unscientific procedure—can anyone arrive at the conclusion that physical causation, itself wholly unaccountable, will account for everything else.

Mr. Herbert's argument is that, even though 'it is perfectly true that the whole weight of scientific testimony goes to establish the unbroken continuity of physical change throughout the material universe,'[2] and so to exclude the action of any intelligence human or Divine,—yet, on overwhelming evidence, which he would call non-scientific, we accept the facts of mind, including 'intentions and desires which are followed by actions which fulfil them.' On evidence equally non-scientific, according to him, but equally decisive, we believe in the action of Divine Intelligence.

'The ceaseless activities and mighty product of the ordered material universe, equally explained, in a scientific sense, by unbroken physical causation, compel the further inference that intelligence designed and governs the whole.'[3]

A fortiori, say we, is this inference legitimate if our contention is true that the universe *cannot* be explained by unbroken physical causation.

III.

The Supernatural in Nature is the title of a recent work, the aim of which may be stated briefly to be, to show, on the one hand, that while the circle of mechanical connections is very far from complete in regard to man and in regard to the universe, there are abundant indications of an Unseen Power working out purpose, and on the other hand that the Biblical account of creation admits of being harmonized with the most advanced discoveries of science. The work consists of a series of Studies, in which different lines of thought are pursued. It is not an example of close reasoning. It contains, perhaps, little that is absolutely new. But the combination of a mass of scientific detail—introduced on the ground that

[1] It is only fair to remember that in consequence of the author's death the work was never quite finished.

[2] *Modern Realism*, p. 380.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 382.

Digitized by Google

'the true discoveries of science are themselves revelations of the Divine Presence and Work, a psalmody of Wisdom and Power'—with expressions of earnest religious conviction, with sensible views of Biblical interpretation, with some success in reconciling revelation and science, and with—what seem to us the most valuable parts of the book—thoughtful meditations interspersed throughout, renders it a book of some importance. We are bound to say that, though in fullest sympathy with the author's general view, we fear his work will not endure severe criticism. His style is certainly too diffuse and somewhat rambling. Judicious selection and compression would improve the work. Many obscure sentences might have a little light let into them with advantage, *e.g.* 'the order of manifestation throughout all mental phenomena is the same as throughout all material phenomena—there is unity.'[1] Some problematical statements of science might be omitted without loss: some scientific assumptions might be met with a greater show of firmness and consistency, as the assumption of the past eternity and the absolute indestructibility of matter, in dealing with which subject the author appears to lose the real thread of the question in his disquisition on our undoubted ignorance of what matter really is, and the possible truth of the Idealist's view is ignored, though this affords an escape from many difficulties. Some obviously faulty expressions might be corrected, as 'sequent states of consciousness produced in the muscles of the eyes.'[2] Such words as 'exceptive' and 'betterment' might be replaced by others more satisfactory. The charge of *petitio principii* might be guarded against by giving proof instead of bare assertion, as, 'It is possible to reduce all phenomena to one cause.' Some inconsistent statements require to be brought into harmony, as 'Many ages back . . . an enormous nebulous mass existed at and around the place now occupied by the solar system,'[3] compared with the statement that the solar system is

[1] *The Supernatural in Nature*, p. 37. These words are in the main a quotation from Mr. Herbert Spencer, though no reference is supplied; but we fear that he would feel a little mystified by the 'correlation' of the manifestations which *he* means with 'redemption' and 'sanctification.'

[2] *Ibid.* p. 90.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 205, 206. There are printer's errors in the statistics on the following page; and in several places a quotation is introduced with the proper marks, while there are none to show where it ends. We should like to know, too, whether the remark (which *has* the full complement of quotation marks) that there is 'no essential difference between the drowning of a superfluous baby and a superfluous kitten' (p. 428) is an inference of our author's from alien principles; or, if really a quotation, to whom we are indebted for the sentiment.

Digitized by Google

moving through space.[1] There appears to be some inconsistency in the carrying out of the figurative interpretation of Genesis. For example, the author sensibly remarks that 'the Scriptural account of creation was intended to be regarded as pictorial, symbolical, mystical,'[2] and ingeniously supports this view in regard to the word 'day' by the language of the fourth commandment: 'As the day of toil to man, so is the day of the rest (*sic*); and as the day of work to God, so is the day of repose.'[3] Then he denies any reality to the Divine rest, though surely the appearance of man marks a distinct stage in creation: but though he gives absolutely no definite meaning to God's rest at one moment, in the next he enforces by it the literal obligation of the Sabbath for all time. There is certainly a wild use of language in such a passage as the following: 'Adam, and we in him, are not only in the form of God, but it is characteristic that, being in the form of God, we are still men: for Christ, by regeneration, is God-man; and we, through Christ, are by regeneration, God-men.'[4] Lastly, ghost stories and *clairvoyance* would not be introduced by any sober scientific reasoner in support of religion, and to treat them seriously can only be productive of mischief in many ways.

But a truce to the ungrateful task of criticism. No one can read the book without recognizing in it a vein of true piety and many passages of considerable beauty. The fact that the Bible can be adapted to the science of every age is one of vast importance, and, as the author points out, no ancient cosmogony besides the Mosaic can anyhow be brought into harmony with the science of the present day.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the foregoing article was in type we have seen the second edition of *The Supernatural in Nature*.[5] Some of the points to which we have referred have received attention, and there are many minor changes, some of which are improvements. But the chief faults remain. We much regret that the improvement of the work is not more radical, for it contains much that is of sterling excellence now alloyed with metal of far different quality. We shall not be accused of

[1] *The Supernatural in Nature*, p. 217. The authority should have been quoted for the statement of the rate of movement.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 132. [3] *Ibid.* p. 135. [4] *Ibid.* p. 272.

[5] The author's name &c. are now given as Joseph William Reynolds, M.A., President of Sion College, Vicar of S. Stephen's, Spitalfields (1880). One result of the alterations is to make the pagination different.

Digitized by Google

random depreciation by any well informed reader of the following words: 'Certainly nerve-force may exert itself from a distance and bring the brain of one person into direct dynamical communication with another (*sic*).'[1]

ART. IX.—LIFE OF BISHOP MILMAN.

Memoir of the Right Rev. Robert Milman, D.D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India. By his Sister, FRANCES MARIA MILMAN. (London, 1879.)

RICH as the Church of England, during the last quarter of a century, has been in Episcopal biographies, it is still not a little singular that one year, 1879, should have seen the publication of the lives of three bishops, of all of whom it may safely be asserted that the primitive Church never entered on her diptychs names more worthy of loving memory: Bishop Wilberforce (though, alas! his life is but a fragment), Bishop Selwyn, and Bishop Milman. It is remarkable, too, that we should have in these three, representatives of three great divisions of the English Church, the Home, the Colonial (for it is specially as a Colonial bishop that Bishop Selwyn's name will be remembered), and the Indian.

The names of the two first have long been household words wherever the English Church has spread throughout the world. No memoirs will increase the reputation which they won for themselves while living. The case of Bishop Milman is very different. He did not start in life with the prestige which belonged to the others, and he was, comparatively speaking, unknown beyond a small circle when he left this country for India, never to return; and though he made for himself in India a name beyond any of his predecessors, able as many of them were, yet, for some unaccountable reason, India is beyond the range of English interests.

It is on this account that we are the more anxious to call attention to the life of Bishop Milman, which his sister has given us, so that English Churchmen may know how good and great a man they have lost. Few, we believe, will put down the book without feeling that he was a man well worthy

[1] *The Supernatural in Nature*, 2nd edition, p. 369.

Digitized by Google

to take his place with Bishops Wilberforce and Selwyn. Some, perhaps, will even agree with the opinion entertained by those whose privilege it was to know him well, that though his abilities were of a less popular character, yet that in real power of intellect, in acuteness of reasoning, in depth of learning, in facility of acquiring knowledge, and in retentiveness of memory, he was unsurpassed.

In one introductory chapter we find all that is to be told of Robert Milman's life previous to his appointment to the see of Calcutta in January 1867, when in his fifty-first year. His life had been singularly uneventful. Neither at Westminster School nor at Oxford was there much to distinguish him from his fellows. His reputation at Westminster seems chiefly to have been gained for steadiness of head and nerve, shown in walking round the outside of one of the towers of the Abbey on the projecting cornice.

After leaving Oxford, where he took a second class in 1837, and being ordained to a curacy in 1839, he was appointed in 1840 to the living of Chaddleworth, a small village in Berkshire, which he exchanged in 1851 for Lambourne, in the same county, where he spent another eleven years toiling day and night to reclaim one of the wildest and most neglected parishes in the county.

Here he might have remained to the end of his life, labouring on faithfully and diligently, with no ambition except to do God's work according to His will, had he not attracted the discriminating notice of Bishop Wilberforce, one of whose chief merits it was to be ever on the look-out for raw material which he might convert to the use of his diocese and of the Church at large. The Bishop seized upon him to assist him in his missions, then commencing, to take part in courses of Lent sermons at Oxford, to lecture to the students at Cuddesdon Theological College; and in 1862 persuaded him to accept the poor but more important living of Great Marlow, where he remained till summoned to India, for which he sailed within five weeks of his appointment.

It was a happy thing for Robert Milman, and ultimately for the Church, that he had been allowed twenty-two years of retirement and study, and that he made the most of his opportunities. He read systematically and voraciously, often far into the night, so as to have but four or five hours in bed, not only works on theology, ancient and modern, English and foreign, but lighter literature of all kinds; and he not only read, but remembered, and could reproduce what he read, so as to be able to preach or lecture when called upon at the

Digitized by Google

shortest notice. An instance of this is given. When asked to lecture on S. Anselm to the Cuddesdon students, the following week, he quietly said, 'I have read all S. Anselm: I will come,' and the lectures he gave are described by one of the students as superior to anything he had heard before, in ability and depth and fresh first-hand learning; 'Milman appeared familiar with all the history, philosophy, and general life of those ages.' Of another course of lectures given at Cuddesdon, in 1857, on S. Clement of Alexandria, Dr. Liddon (no mean authority) has remarked, 'I have never forgotten his lectures, so vivid was his description of the characteristic teaching and methods of the Alexandrian school. He was able to throw a peculiar freshness over all sorts of old subjects.'

It has been said that the strength of the English Church has ever been in her country parsonages, and doubtless, as in the case of Robert Milman, there is a large reserve of power and dormant energy of which the world knows nothing, till some accident, so to speak, calls it forth. Then, from time to time, some great orator, or divine, or historian, or administrator suddenly appears on the stage from an unsuspected quarter.

We are ready, when some acknowledged leader, some champion of the faith, is taken from us, to say, as King James said of Douglas—

> 'I have not any captains more
> Of such account as he;'

but we believe that the English Church might often more truly take the nobler view of the English king, and say, as he did of Percy—

> 'Thank God, I have within my realm
> Five hundred good as he.'

The English Church has the men, but does not always know where to find them to her hand, and under our hap-hazard system of patronage cannot always put them, when found, in the right place. What Gray said of the country churchyard is equally true of the country parsonage: that many live and die unknown to fame, whose abilities fitted them for a wider field and more extensive influence. They need not, indeed, be wasted, for no work done for God, in however humble a sphere, can fail to have its influence for good. If Robert Milman had lived and died at Chaddleworth, he would not have lived in vain; but unhappily all are not like him, and we fear that there are many who fritter away their lives or sink into stagnation, because a small parish does not appear to furnish a sufficiently wide field for their energies.

Digitized by Google

Of late years, Church congresses, Diocesan conferences and missions have done much to bring to the front men who might otherwise have remained unknown, and have been of the greatest advantage to the men themselves in opening a wider scope for their energies; but there are many who may well be stirred up to fresh activity by reading of Robert Milman in his country parish: how, though by nature addicted to literary pursuits, and keenly sensitive to the attractions of social intercourse, he held all these things as nothing when weighed in the balance against the work that he had set before him, and would abandon them without a thought to force his way through frost and snow to some distant cottage-lecture or service, just as afterwards in India he would undertake a laborious journey of many days and nights, and all as the merest matter of course, without any consciousness of sacrifice.

But the point which we would especially impress on the younger clergy is this: that Bishop Milman, though left for years in a quiet country village and in the discharge of very simple duties, was all the time fitting himself for that wider sphere to which in God's providence he was destined.

If, from the earliest days of his ministry, he could have foreseen that he would one day be called upon to take the oversight of the Church in India, he could not have devised for himself a more appropriate training than that which he went through, so that, when the call came, he started up as a soldier fully armed and equipped for the conflict. Not to speak of the habits which he formed of unwearying labour, forgetfulness of self and consideration of others, ungrudging liberality, and entire devotion to his Master's work, the stores of accurate knowledge which he amassed from systematic reading of the Fathers and ecclesiastical history, the acquaintance which he made with all the forms of modern thought and speculation, German as well as English, his acquisition of foreign languages, all proved of the utmost value to one 'who was called upon,' as he said, 'in India to review every question of Church doctrine and discipline and practice with reference to first principles;' who had to contend with the native superstition and imported unbelief of the subtle Oriental mind, and to make himself a master of the various languages and dialects of his vast diocese.

No wonder that with a preparation of this kind, added to his natural powers, and, far more than this, with that singleness of purpose, that simple faith, and deep humility, and entire self-abnegation which so remarkably characterized him,

Digitized by Google

the Bishop made such a mark in India as, in the opinion of a Presbyterian high in office, no man had ever made before.

Robert Milman was, above all his predecessors, a Missionary Bishop. The great work of Bishop Cotton had been making provision for the education of the Eurasians and poorer Europeans, a class strangely neglected before. Bishop Milman, while he took the deepest interest in the Hill Schools, founded with this object, and while he never forgot the claims of either soldiers or civilians, had especially at heart the conversion of India, which seemed to him 'God's reason for giving to England this strange dominion.' The spirit in which he undertook and discharged the office of Bishop cannot be better described than in words dictated by himself just before his death—'At any cost and at any sacrifice, as far as I am concerned, India shall be won to the Lord Jesus.' He tried to instil the same feeling into the Government chaplains :—

'I must ask you,' he writes to one, 'for Christ's sake to throw your interest and sympathy into this (mission) work. You are before Christ as responsible for the heathen round about you as you are for the British soldiers. There is no evading this accountability by anyone who undertakes an Indian chaplaincy. I felt it in my own person even terribly when I accepted the Bishopric, most reluctantly, God is witness. You will find that working with your Mission Committee will be a real help and assistance to your English work, in which may God bless and prosper you more and more.'

'He gave dignity to mission work,' was the remark of one of the missionaries ; while the native Christians said 'he was the first bishop who made them feel that they also had a bishop.'

It has been the fashion, with some of late, to speak of the connexion of bishops in India with the Government as a fatal hindrance to missionary work. This was not Bishop Milman's view. Whatever may have been the case in the earlier days of the Episcopate, and whatever colour may have been given to such a notion by the wording of the original Letters Patent, no one one can read Bishop Milman's 'Journal' without seeing that he was practically as unfettered as any missionary of a voluntary association could possibly have been, and could speak the truth as boldly without fear of man ; while at the same time his official position gained for him a more ready hearing, and gave additional weight to his words. The Bishop felt very strongly the importance to Christianity, in the eyes of the natives, of maintaining the Establishment in India. He said, with reference to a pro-

Digitized by Google

posal to abolish bishops in Ceylon, that without entering into higher questions, even politically they were not useless.

'In our Eastern regions it is a great misfortune when there is not some "spiritual" person in a good position, and of larger thought than missionaries in general. Certainly, in India, we bishops are more of a link between Europeans and natives than anyone else. I really think that I have done more to promote a friendly feeling between English and native society than anyone; not, of course, from any ability or energy, but simply from putting the natives at their ease.'

The Bishop's notion of missionary work was not confined to directly religious ministrations. His social gatherings at Calcutta, and his lectures to educated natives in all the large centres of his diocese, were a most striking and successful part of his work. With reference to the first, the conversaziones, to which he invited the native gentlemen to meet the European society of Calcutta at his palace, Dr. Norman McLeod, who was present on one occasion during his visit to India, thus writes:—

'The Viceroy and State officers, missionaries, judges, and professors represented European society, while natives of rank—rajahs, princes, Hindu and Mahomedan, barristers, and editors of native papers—represented native society. Here they all met in the house of a Christian Bishop as his friends and guests. How wise, how conciliatory, how Christian was the idea of such an assemblage! The more we know of the world as it is, the more we feel the vast power of personal intercourse as a means of creating a better understanding between man and man, of increasing charity and destroying prejudice. Nowhere on earth is this personal intercourse more difficult, and yet nowhere is it more needed, than among the natives and Europeans in India. It is needed between governors and governed, between missionaries and those whom they instruct. The meeting at the Bishop's was to me peculiarly pleasing, as recognizing, and in as far as possible meeting, this great want.'

Very remarkable must have been the spectacle which these gatherings presented to the eye:—

'Native ladies in white veils, Armenian and Greek priests, Parsees and strangers from many parts of India, or even from the far East, like the King of Siam, used to be present at these assemblies, which from the gorgeous dress of the natives, their splendid turbans and jewels, formed a striking and brilliant scene in the beautiful house, with its wide verandahs, which the liberality of Bishop Wilson had given to the see of Calcutta.'

No one, we think, can for a moment doubt what the moral effect must have been, and it seems to have been acknow-

Digitized by Google

leged by all parties. Meetings of another kind, and with a more distinctly religious aim, are mentioned by the Bishop in a letter written in 1871 :—

'Several clever Bramo Samaj and other earnest native Baboos are desirous of conversing with myself and others on religious topics. They have been once at my house, and are coming again to-night; but the palace is too far from their dwellings. Can you allow us to meet once a week for about eight weeks in any large room in your establishment? And can you and other friends join us in our discussions? The help of thoughtful and clever laymen is very desirable on such occasions. Our first subject was "The State of the Roman world when Christianity prevailed in it." Our subject to-night is the "Criterion of Truth." We meet at eight p.m., and the discussion lasts perhaps two hours. I think it better that the meetings should not be, or be called, missionary, as it might give the educated natives a prejudice against them; therefore I wish for a room not in any Missionary College, but where we may all meet on equal terms. If you were disengaged this evening, and could be at the palace at eight, you would be able to judge for yourself of the nature of these discussions. What they will lead to, or if they will lead to anything, is of course in God's hand. We have to argue with men of great subtlety and considerable knowledge, and, as far as I can tell, of real piety in their way. The rationalistic views of Europe are known to them, and cast many difficulties in their way. It is very anxious work.'

At another time, lectures of a still more decidedly religious character, on such subjects as 'Eternal Life,' 'The One True God,' 'Jesus Christ the Mediator,' 'The Mission of Christ,' were given by the Bishop at Mirzapore, the native side of the city of Calcutta, and were largely attended. Other lectures, not of a directly missionary character, were given to educated natives on literary or philosophic subjects, ranging over a wide field, such as 'Epic Poetry,' 'The Characteristics of Race,' Truth, Faith, Revelation, Eclecticism. But they were all made subsidiary to the great object which he ever kept before his mind, the conversion of his hearers. He 'spoke right out.' Unfortunately, these addresses were delivered extempore, and were very imperfectly reported, if at all. Of one on 'Truth,' characterized as a powerful and forcible address, delivered with all the eloquence of earnestness and enthusiasm, a gentleman who heard it says :—

'I am sure it made a great, and I trust lasting, impression on all. Free from bigotry, free from every allusion that could hurt the feelings or irritate a believer in another faith than the Christian, it seemed to me the ideal of missionary teaching. So I can imagine Bishop Milman's great predecessor preaching to attentive multitudes in the

Digitized by Google

market-place at Athens, on the text: "Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."'

Of the last which he delivered at Umritsur a writer in the *Calcutta Review* says: 'It is not unfitting that the last of these striking addresses should have been on a subject which gave opportunity for as true a missionary heart as ever beat to give utterance to the yearnings of a lifetime, "The Offence of the Cross," and none who heard it will easily forget that grand apology for a Christian's faith.'

It was this yearning of the Bishop's heart for the conversion of India to Christ which made him set so much store by the acquisition of the native languages. 'I feel that I ought scarcely to have accepted Calcutta without some polyglottism, and I must work to make up the deficiency, though it is late to begin.' How he worked, and how he succeeded, his memoirs amply prove.

It may well have seemed marvellous, as it did, that one who came to India for the first time at the age of fifty-one, and was necessarily immersed in English work, should be able to preach without notes in Hindi, Hindustani, and Bengali, and to conduct services in some of the less known dialects and varieties of these languages as well. His studies were chiefly carried on in trains, *dâk gharris*, boats, *palkis*. An Arabic or Persian grammar would often occupy a dusty journey or a boat voyage down the rivers.

The Rev. R. Winter says of a lecture given by the Bishop to the Delhi Literary Society, on the 'Progress of Literature,' in Hindustani: 'He spoke most eloquently for an hour, without a note before him, on a subject demanding language very different from that needed in religious addresses, and including the use of a large number of scientific and technical terms.' Nor, great as was the Bishop's power of acquiring language, was the knowledge acquired without sheer hard work, and grinding at grammars like (or unlike) any schoolboy. He surprised his moonshee by his unprecedentedly rapid mastery of 'irregular roots.' In a letter home in 1868 he tells little C., 'I am a good boy to learn my grammar very diligently. It is unpleasant at my time of life, but I want to be able to preach in one or two languages, if possible.' At another time: 'I am amusing myself by working at Burmese. It is an agglutinative language of which I am glad to get an idea . . . I have taken a Burmese lad from the Rangoon school to coach me. The pronunciation is very difficult.'

We cannot be surprised, with the Bishop's strong feeling of the claims of India upon England, to find him again and

Digitized by Google

again lamenting over the apathy that existed on the subject, and the difficulty of getting men or women to go out and labour for Christ.

'Alas for our lack of men and lack of mission spirit in England, especially with regard to India. It is heart-breaking!

'I wonder devout and able men do not have their hearts kindled to come out and help us here. The fields of labour will not wait. Others step in where our men ought to be, or missions actually relapse and come to nothing.

'I am very anxious to have a sisterhood, a working one, out here, but cannot yet succeed in hearing of any ladies who would volunteer. I grudge them to Africa, where they cannot be half so much wanted. But there is no sentiment about India and an extravagant prejudice against its climate, whereas now, with the hills when wanted, it is healthy enough for any one.'

And to the same effect, when looking forward to a visit home:—

'People think, when I put in a personal appearance at home, there will be no difficulty in obtaining recruits. I have doubts myself, as I am an *Indian*; if I were African or Melanesian, it would be easier. I am in desperate want of men, but still, with Bishop Patteson, would rather do without men than have unsuitable assistants. I find that, at least in our Church missions, men from Oxford and Cambridge are the best workers and the most devoted and successful.'

It is pleasant, after reading such language, to think, as an indication of some change at least in public feeling, of the Cambridge mission to Delhi, now numbering six graduates, and of the projected Oxford mission to Calcutta: both doubtless in some measure due to the Bishop's appeals, and an answer to his prayers.

We do not propose to follow in chronological order the narrative of Bishop Milman's episcopal labours, but rather to extract such passages as may give a general notion of the man himself, of the character and variety of his work, and of his opinions on different subjects of interest. We are well aware of the ignorance of Indian geography which prevails amongst non-Indian readers, and we believe that it would be hopeless to get them to follow the Bishop's visitation tours. As a rule, eight months in every year were spent in locomotion through all parts of a diocese, extending from Peshawur on the north-west to Burmah on the south-east, and, on the occasion of his visitation as Metropolitan, embracing Ceylon.

Very different were most of these journeys from those which the first Bishop of India describes in his journal, when, with a large retinue and a military escort, there was a leisurely

Digitized by Google

progress of about fifteen miles a day, which, however monotonous and tiresome, afforded time for rest and study.

The railway enabled Bishop Milman to rush from one end of his diocese to another without stopping, 1,100 miles at a stretch, while, in order to reach the places remote from railways, he had recourse to every imaginable kind of conveyance, including floating down a river on inflated skins. Horses, ponies, camels and elephants, palkis and dâk gharris, railway trucks and dog-carts, boats, yachts, and steamers, were put in requisition, according to circumstances, by day and night. The Bishop never allowed any obstacles or difficulties, any considerations of fatigue or danger, to stand in the way of his keeping an engagement which he had made. We sometimes read of his travelling at night and arriving in the morning just in time for morning service, and yet going through a long and fatiguing day's work. Sometimes we are thankful to hear of his going to bed even for a couple of hours before his work began. Out of two months spent in his Central Indian tour in 1869, twenty-six nights were passed on the road without going to bed.

These are specimens of various modes of travelling :—

'The journey down the river Jhelum in boats in which he and his chaplain slept, and then by riding and driving across country, took ten days of incessant travelling. It proved longer than was expected, and when it was completed, they only reached Ferozepore three-quarters of an hour before the time fixed for a confirmation of fifty-nine candidates, many of them soldiers.

'After dinner we left in doolies, in which we travelled all night. At 2 a.m. we changed bearers, and met Captain Gordon, who gave us a cup of tea by moonlight on the road. In the early morning Captain Jenkins kindly met us and mounted us. We had police horses, strong and active, but a little wild. We changed horses half way. About two miles from the station Major Godley met us with his carriage, a good English-built double dog-cart. The distance from Kohat to Bunnoo is eighty-seven miles, and by our various conveyances we had accomplished it in about twenty hours.'

And here is a specimen of what the Bishop considered a fair day's work at Umritsur :—

'At 8 a.m. I attended a short service at the Station Church. I celebrated the holy communion, and preached to the soldiers. At 11 I held the ordination in the Native Church, which was quite full, when two were ordained priests and four deacons. The service was partly in English, partly in Hindustani, which not only made the service too long, but was rather confusing. The congregation, however, seemed much impressed with the solemnity of the service, Imad-ud-din's ordination doubtless attracting many spectators. There

Digitized by Google

were eighty communicants, and the service lasted three hours. At half-past 4 I attended service at the Station Church and preached for the local mission, which is one of the most active and satisfactory I have seen. After the evening service, about six, we left for Loodiana, crossed the Bear River, and arrived on the morning of the 7th.'

The Imad-ud-din here mentioned was a learned Mahometan moulvie, who afterwards was made the Bishop's chaplain.

Other extracts from the Bishop's journal will show that he had not only labours but perils, by land and water :—

'In one spot our guide, who had been behind us, said it was fortunate we had waited for him, as the straight road which we should naturally have taken would have brought us into a deep quicksand. We might thus quietly have disappeared, and been heard of no more. Thanking God for His mercy, we continued our ride.

'I could not bring my sister on this tour; the travelling is too difficult and a little risky. We had to cross the jungle the other day near Atterghur, having taken the wrong road, and were within an ace of being benighted; the jungle being full of panthers and tigers which abound in this country, although not in general man-eaters.

'Then we had to ride on trollies or lories, as they call them, over the bridges, consisting only of the iron rails of the tramway of the railroad; quite safe, but nervous work, if you have nerves.'

From Patna :—

'I have had a rather laborious tour in Central India. I think I can endorse Bishop Wilberforce's opinion in favour of the bishops in the Colonies retiring before death.

'The Episcopi of England, who sit at home at ease,
How little do they know of the dangers of the *sees*.

'They little know what our Eastern journeys are. I am sure that the physique of an athlete is a necessary qualification for effectual supervision of such dioceses as we have here. We heard of tigers in all directions, but we did not come across any of those lively animals. They are not reckoned dangerous to man in that part, but when a man shoots six before breakfast, they are certainly plentiful.'

The Bishop himself was not troubled with nerves. On finding the bridge over the Jumna broken, he crossed the river on planks, at a considerable height, fastened to the piers of the broken suspension bridge. As the Jumna is a strong and rushing river, not fordable there even for elephants, the chaplain, a much younger man, who had nerves, had to be swung over by ropes in a basket. The Bishop's feat was a wonderful proof of steady head and nerves. At another time—

'I have had some hardish travelling lately, but remain, thank God, strong, though at times weary. I have had to ride fifty miles and to walk ten or twelve, and can still do so without discomfort.'

Digitized by Google

Again—

'We have at last reached Dalhousie, after a tedious and difficult, though not dangerous journey. The rivers were a good deal out and the road broken and slippery. We had to be carried over one river on a "charpoy," on the men's heads. I think, if it had not been for my dignity, I should have stripped and waded myself.

'I have had some rather hard travelling lately, but am none the worse for it. The railways, which were "smashed up," are nearly mended again now. For a time India was almost cut in half.

'We—that is, I and Jacob—came down forty miles of the river on musaks (inflated skins), which was rather amusing. But by it we got parted from our luggage. I had consequently some loafer-like travelling for a time, all alone without servants or baggage. However, I am sufficiently known not to be taken up for an impostor. My robes were of the Bartholomew Fair style, rigged up for the occasion by the chaplains' wives. But we are not ceremoniously critical, and I did the best I could to look episcopal.'

The epitaph written by Sir Arthur Hobhouse, for a monument erected to the Bishop's memory in Calcutta Cathedral, will seem in no way overstrained to those who have read his journals:—

'SÆPE VERSATUS IN ITINERIBUS
IN PERICULIS FLUMINUM SOLITUDINE MARIS
IN LABORE ET FATIGATIONE
IN VIGILIIS SÆPENUMERO
IN JEJUNIIS FREQUENTER
IN QUOTIDIANA OMNIUM ECCLESIARUM CURA
OPES VIRES VITAM DENIQUE
DEO HOMINIBUSQUE DICANS
DEDIT NON PERDIDIT.'

For, indeed, it is our conviction that few men have ever more closely followed the example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, not only in unwearied labours, but in the single aim to live to God's glory and spread His knowledge, counting all things else in comparison as nothing.

This, we think, will be the impression given to all by the records of his life now made public, as it was by the life itself, to those who had the privilege of knowing him. In confirmation of this we are allowed to quote from a letter written, after reading the Memoir, by one of the most distinguished divines of our day:—

'I was unable to read without a great many feelings of self-reproach, which such an example of what can be done with life in our day inevitably suggests. The beauty of the book is that the moral interest is always heightening. There are no shadows, no temporary fallings back which are afterwards recovered. It is a true commentary

Digitized by Google

on "the path of the just, as a shining light shining more and more unto the perfect day."'

Nothing but an iron constitution—or, as he says himself, the physique of an athlete—would have enabled the Bishop to get through the amount of bodily exertion which he did, travelling by night and working by day. But his mental activity was quite as remarkable as his physical endurance. It is marvellous to hear of him as we do continually, after a day of toil, giving a lecture on some literary or philosophical subject, which must have required much thought and preparation, and this, too, often in a foreign language. We may judge of the difficulties of any kind of study from his own description :—

'I have to keep up a large business correspondence, without an office or a clerk, when I and my chaplain are travelling night and day, and have much work at each station I visit. The climate is also a puzzle, and sometimes the damp, sometimes the drought, spoils all letter-copying books. The movement of boats, and winds, and punkahs, disturb the letters as I write them; you must therefore make excuses for me.'

At another time he says :—

'The fever (caught from riding in the rain) was busy with me all the time I was here, and I have a difficulty in remembering what took place, as I had no time to make notes.'

And yet with all his journeying, and his care of all the churches, the Bishop contrived to keep himself acquainted with the books of the day. He tells his cousin not to forget to send him any striking work as soon as it comes out. 'Anything important, either of faith or infidelity, I am glad of.'

Here is a specimen of the 'mass of unorthodoxy' which he got through in a leisure time at Mussoorie :—

'I read Baumgarten, Ewald, Hare, re-read *Ecce Homo*, read Keim, Noach—a wonderful piece of clever blasphemy—Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, began Strauss, read Sepp, Renan, and dipped into others.

'What a wonderful literature it is, all concentering on the life of Jesus, however different the views may be. May God keep me from all error and sanctify me in the truth. "*Thy word is truth.*" It certainly comes out more and more as *the* truth the more it is studied. It is curious to see Noach scoffing at the Swabian (Strauss) and the *Gallic Cock* (Renan) for the feebleness of their unbelief and negation, yet gradually becoming more and more wrapped up in the person of the Lord, and unable to divest himself of the attraction. "*He being lifted up draws all men unto Him.*"'

His criticisms are sometimes trenchant, but with a vein of quiet humour running through them :—

Digitized by Google

'I have got *Vaticanism*, and Manning's reply, which I have only glanced at. He is the coolest hand at saying impressive nothings that I ever heard of. He was always deficient in accuracy and real knowledge, and yet always was, or appeared to be, unhesitatingly confident in himself. I see he has been promulgating wild history at Canterbury, when consecrating the little papal church built there.'

'Is it yet known who is the author of *Supernatural Religion*? It is very slow, and a mass of fallacies, though with much book learning: a kind of Buckle, but only a brass buckle in comparison with the original.

'I have been reading Orby Shipley. I don't think much of Orby.'

But it must not be supposed that the bishop was incapable of seeing the merits of an opponent. He was of a singularly fair and unbiassed mind, and his sympathies were very wide. No better illustration of this can be given than an article (*Three Essays on Religion*, by John Stuart Mill) written by him in the *Calcutta Review*, which we think his sister has done well in reprinting, as showing the attitude of the Bishop's mind towards one of the greatest of modern sceptics: 'the pity of one strong in his own faith for the man who had cut himself off from all spiritual comforts, and bound himself down by the iron chains of his pitiless logic to this earth alone, for the satisfaction of all the yearnings and aspirations of his sensitive and passionate nature.'

The article well deserves perusal, both as a specimen of acute and masterly criticism, and as showing the Bishop's readiness to enter into and sympathize with the difficulties and trials, the noble aspirations and purposes, of 'so powerful and burning a mind, cast from the first dawn of its intellectual life into so tremendous and inexorable a mould.'

We cannot refrain from quoting the concluding passage of the article, which strikes us as singularly beautiful both in language and idea:—

'Is it even presumptuous to follow the soul going out into that future in that ill-defined but quickening hope—to imagine how that eagle eye may at last sink, and that daring forehead bow, and as the full light of truth shines out behind the veil, how the spirit may at last recognize, in all the fulness of Godhead and Manhood, Him whom, however imperfectly, he regarded as his ideal? When the great truths rise up before him in all their majesty, may not the great sceptic, like the sceptical but penitent apostle, be ready to fall down and worship, crying, "My Lord and my God"?'

Nor does it seem to us less remarkable that amidst all his cares and fatigues, the Bishop preserved his freshness of spirit and keen appreciation of the beauties of scenery, and still

Digitized by Google

more, that he found time to record his impressions. We find scattered about in his journal exquisite pictures, which showed that he had the eye of a painter as well as the pen of a poet. Such is the following, written of the gardens at Cawnpore :—

'In the centre, the Well of the Massacre, with Marochetti's Angel in white marble standing over it. The moon was rising in a soft purple sky, and sent its rays through the arcaded enclosure, and shone gradually on the cross, the head, and also beneath on the feet and robe of the white marble angel. It had a very solemn and peculiar effect, and you almost seemed to hear the murmur of voices, and to see the shapes of the dead in the deep underneath, in their quiet rest and peace, after the fearful toil and agony of their death.'

Great weight will naturally attach to the opinions formed by a man of such wide views and calm judgment as the Bishop, on questions relating to the Church's mission work in India in its various bearings. He saw plainly that the influence of English law, thought, science, civilization and morality, was inevitably sapping the foundations of ancient prejudices and superstitions. The question which he asked was, whether, amidst fading prejudices and vanishing superstitions, the truth as it is in Jesus was being established in their place? In his first charge he said :—

'As the temple of idolatry and error, great and walled up to heaven, hoary and venerable with the traditions of ages, adorned with poetry and philosophy, sinks before our eyes, do we see amidst its crumbling domes and shattering columns of darkness the vision of the Holy Church of God rising in all its beauty, and gathering under its starry roof the present and the unborn generations of India? If there is a mighty future before it, will it be a Christian future? It is a problem of wonderful interest to all, to us ministers absolutely overwhelming.'

The view which he took was, on the whole, encouraging. He points out that whereas formerly there was among the natives a general contempt or abhorrence of the Christian religion, and a firm persuasion in the superiority of their own systems, they now not only recognized the beauty of the Gospel, the loveliness of our Saviour's character, and the general perfection of the faith which He preached, but they seemed to have a desire that it should be set before them with such attractive force that they might be unable to resist it, that it might compel them to come in.

In his second charge he said that the ratio of highly educated converts, men of position and ability, was on the increase :—

Digitized by Google

'He dwelt on this because some members of the Brahmo Samaj had begun to boast that it had checked the evangelization of India. It is possible that for a season there may be fewer converts. The Samaj certainly offers a kind of halting place for men who have rejected the ancient superstitions and idolatries, but cannot bring themselves to take the decided step of baptism which parts them evidently and irrevocably from their old society.

'Not unnaturally, many in this condition begin to oppose Christianity as having an exclusive claim upon the faith of man. They speak disparagingly in particular of Christian missions and missionaries: but in this are rather repeating the utterances of Positivists and Secularists in and from Europe and America.

'This is not the case with all. There are certainly others who feel more deeply their obligations to the past and present labours of the Christian Church in this land.

'It is our duty to pray day and night that these higher and nobler minds may be drawn on into the full truth. Their labours for the benefit of India may be useful eventually in preparing the way for that reconstruction of society here which seems only possible on a Christian basis.

'They are not, therefore, to be considered as checking the evangelization of India. One reason is sufficient. It is not checked. It is flowing on with the same quiet but effectual stream. Its course may not be so rapid as with the early conversions of Xavier, or with those of the Dutch in Ceylon, in the days of the dominion of Portugal or Holland. But it is what they were not: true, real, permanent as far as it extends. It will not, therefore, be checked, because there is life in it.'

On another occasion he says:—

'The antagonism to Christianity, especially among the Brahmo Samaj, is becoming more and more manifest continually. It has been nursed, it seems to me, more by the whole tone of Government and Government education than by anything else, and is more conspicuous in the native Liberal party than in the old orthodox Hindoos. It is a spirit of scepticism allowing any amount of outward conformity which may save all family disagreements and social antagonisms.'

But, notwithstanding this hindrance, the Bishop continued to entertain great hopes of the evangelization of the land. He did not expect great results at once; but exhorted his clergy to work and work on, in faith and patience, as the children of Israel went day after day round Jericho, and to believe that when 'God gave the word, the walls of unbelief would fall.'

He mentions one remarkable instance of the disappearance of prejudice, in his being asked by the native members of the committee of the native hospital to use a prayer at the laying of the first stone by the Viceroy:—

Digitized by Google

'It seems strange,' he says, 'for Hindus and Mahommedans to be asking for Christian prayers—for, of course, I could give no other—and perhaps it is a good sign. I believe they look on me as a kind of guru (priest) in chief. At all events, it recognizes Christianity as, on the whole, the best religion. We are *not* to have a Mollah and a Brahmin on the right hand and left, and I made it a condition that it should be a Christian prayer, in which Christians could join.'

One of his last expressions of opinion on the subject was—

'The Mission work in India is making slow but steady progress in most places: in one or two its progress is rapid. Education, at its first blush ineffably conceited, is for a time rather working against it. When this phase is past, I trust that some receptive power will form itself in the hearts of our educated natives. It is not so much the *intellectual* as the *moral* power which is wanting. When the fuss and noise and sense of triumph are over, 'the still small voice may make itself heard.'

He deeply felt the tendency of the Government Schools to produce infidelity. 'It is very saddening,' he says, 'especially when we consider what might have been done if Government had been less prejudiced against Christianity officially.'

'I find the natives like me all the better for speaking right out. It has been the stupid tergiversation about religion which has engendered suspicion, not frank and open avowal of our desire for their becoming Christians. There was actually a petition from the students of one of the Government Colleges against the indifference of the English authorities to religion.'

Nor was Bishop Milman at all satisfied with the system of religious instruction in the Mission Schools, especially the uniting of Christian children with heathen in prayers and hymns, and the allowing religious instruction to be given by heathen teachers. We find frequent entries in his Journal to this effect:—

'They sang hymns: Christian hymns seemed out of place in the mouths of children who were mostly heathen; but this is the way of missions, and I think one of the causes of insufficient success, as there is the usual want of distinction between Christians and non-Christians. The religious teaching seemed of the usual indefinite and ineffectual description. The Hindustani Catechism taught by a Mussulman master in the most perfunctory way. I could not get —— to see the danger. . . . They have no real plan of Christian instruction. The teaching is generally very haphazard, irreverent, and unmeaning.'

General Tremenheere has done good service by calling the attention of the Church in England to this subject, as

Digitized by Google

also did the late Bishop of Bombay. There has perhaps, in some quarters, been a tendency to go too much into extremes in the opposite direction, and to advocate undue reserve in communicating religious instruction. Those who wish to see the subject treated with calmness and moderation, by one of all others best qualified to speak from long experience, should read a letter addressed to the Bishop of Madras by Bishop Caldwell, who mentions that in all the schools under his supervision a distinction is made between the Christians and the non-Christians at the daily school prayers. The Christians kneel as an act of worship: the non-Christians stand out of respect. The non-Christians were never asked, much less forced, to kneel; kneeling being considered as a public profession of adherence to the Christian religion. His idea of a missionary schoolmaster, as a man whose leading desire is to soften the hearts of his pupils, and draw them towards God, would exactly be that for which Bishop Milman so much longed.

Another hindrance to conversion, which we find the Bishop continually deploring, are the divisions of the Christian world. It is perhaps too much assumed on platforms in England that all missionaries among the heathen are sharing in one great work. It is forgotten how oftentimes one neutralizes another. 'Our divisions are certainly saddening, and a greater stumbling-block than people fancy.' So, in writing from Santhalia, where there was great promise of fruit, and several devoted clergymen, he says, 'In other parts there are Baptists, and the Free Church of Scotland is opening a mission. It is lamentable that even here our divisions are to be introduced; but so it is, and the difficulty increases day by day. Union is but a distant view, fair though it be and attractive.'

And yet he was anxious that, in spite of these unhappy divisions, Christians should present as united a front as possible to the heathen world without, and therefore he visited the missions not connected with the Church whenever he was asked to do so. Lord Northbrook, in a letter written after the Bishop's death, mentions, as a proof of his largeness of mind, that he extended his sympathy and advice to men, whether in or out of the Church of England, who differed widely from one another on points of minor importance. He never exaggerated any such differences; on the contrary, his earnest desire seemed to be to bring all Christians together, as far as was possible, in a land where they form so small a part of the population.

But he would never, for the sake of apparent unity, com-

Digitized by Google

promise his principles as a Churchman. When applied to sanction a clergyman's preaching in a dissenting chapel, he not only refused his sanction, considering it distinctly wrong (notwithstanding the examples of Deans Stanley and Payne Smith and others, which he thought had done more harm than good), but inhibited the clergyman from the proposed step. 'I am of course aware,' the Bishop says, 'that I may lay myself open to the charge of prejudice and bigotry. I think myself indeed very free from both; but cannot expect the world always to agree with me.' On the occasion of some similar application, he writes:—

'When people wish to do something of which their conscience does not approve, they generally send me a telegraphic question. The necessary brevity forbids explanation, and some naked alternatives are exhibited in their natural difficulty and ugliness, and I am asked to choose between them. The decision would often involve principles of the utmost importance which are not visible at the moment.'

Very various, and often most difficult, were the questions continually coming before him for solution, which he always endeavoured to settle by recurrence to first principles. He said at one time, that since he came to India he had felt himself called upon to review almost every point of Church government and even of Church doctrine, and every ecclesiastical practice, seriously and carefully in connexion with the position there.

Such a question, for instance, was whether a convert with two wives should be baptized. The Bishop decided in the affirmative, after much deliberation and discussion with both clergy and laymen of weight.

'Here in India, where, if the husband were to put away one of his wives, she would be an utter outcast, this appears to me the just solution, if the wives also are willing to become Christians. I should therefore support you in admitting the man and his family to baptism on the above conditions.'

It was the very exceptional position of married people in India which justified to the Bishop's mind a departure from the general rule. The man was to pledge himself to monogamy for his children, and not to be admitted to the ministry or any ecclesiastical position.

The question of authorizing and regulating the services of laymen had naturally forced itself on the Bishop from the first in a country where, from the paucity of clergy, many ministerial functions had ordinarily been discharged by lay-

Digitized by Google

men. In 1872, after five years' experience of India, he drew up a paper, in which, dealing with the subject with his usual knowledge and judgment, after explaining the needs of the country, he proposed to revive the two minor orders of Reader and Sub-deacon, making it clearly understood that they were not to be looked upon as leading on to higher orders, or as having any indelible character. At any time the reader or sub-deacon might resign their commissions, and the Bishop might recall or suspend them, on his own motion or that of the clergyman of the station.

The sub-deacon, in addition to the duties usually assigned to lay readers under a bishop's licence at home, was authorized to assist the celebrant in the administration of the chalice in the Holy Communion, to baptize in cases of emergency, to officiate at burials, and to prepare candidates for confirmation under the superintendence of the clergyman.

We are thankful to hear that the number of sub-deacons has steadily increased: already, in 1876, they numbered twenty-six, and their services have been much valued.

The following remarks seem to us well worthy of consideration, at home as well as in India. We believe that, if acted on fifty years ago, they might have prevented a great deal of our Dissent:—

'The more our Church laity feel, that when Church clergy are wanting they ought themselves to exercise the universal Christian priesthood within proper limits, instead of making use in an uncomfortable way of the ministers of various denominations, the better for themselves, for the Church, for the aforesaid ministers, and for the cause of our dear Lord in general.'

No one valued more than Bishop Milman the outward ordinances of religion, or set greater store by order and decency in public worship, but he never forgot that the inner life was more than the outward form. From the time that he first had had a parish he never intermitted daily service: 'if two or three can come it is a fulfilment of the Church-rule, and has a special comfort to the earnest minister of Christ;' but there was a danger, he felt, of its superseding or shortening private prayer. It should, he said, 'be balanced, in order to be effectual, by more rather than less.'

The want of decent ritual in his diocese was very distressing to him:—

'I do not think bad and untidy buildings lead to edification. They are one of the common drawbacks in missions, and are to some extent a denial of the glory which the preacher proclaims. They do

Digitized by Google

not announce Christ as a great King. Too often the arrangements seem to designate the missionary as the proper object of worship. Of course this is not intentional, but it is the impression which an unbiassed mind derives, and it is uncomfortable.'

The danger to him in India seemed defect rather than excess of ritual, and he continually urged more attention to outward decency. On the other hand, he was most anxious that unnecessary offence should not be given and the law of love forgotten. He writes to a chaplain:—

'That which may be done without offence at home often cannot be done out here, and a division which may be of little account in a Christian country may in a heathen land be a most dangerous obstacle to the diffusion of the truth.'

The Bishop, we are told, always adopted the Eastward position himself, as most in accordance with the Prayer-Book, and no difficulty seems to have arisen in his diocese, as in Ceylon, with the C. M. S. clergy. There appeared to him a tendency at home to attach undue importance to ritual questions. At the distance of India, the points in dispute appeared so minute as to be almost ridiculous. It seemed to him that the younger generation 'lacked the simplicity, energy, and self-denial which characterized the leaders in the great revival of devotion and Church life: that there was more fuss than fire, more demonstration than devotion.'

It is clear, however, that this charge was not intended to apply to all of the younger generation. He gave credit to many for energy and devotion. He believed that they had done much, gathered in and converted many souls, taught them the true life of God; but he thought that the introduction of needless ceremonies had marred a great work, and that they could have done more without them, and not have stirred up the spirit of antagonism and produced the Church Association.

At the same time he was anxious to secure the services of the Cowley Fathers for mission work in his diocese, feeling that brotherhoods and sisterhoods were especially wanted in India, and subsequently welcomed the Rev. S. W. O'Neil.

One of the most remarkable episodes in the Bishop's Episcopate was the reception into the communion of the English Church of the Lutheran mission at Chota Nagpore, in Lower Bengal, about 300 miles from Calcutta, among the Kôl tribes. As the Bishop's action in this matter was misunderstood, and exposed him to a great deal of misrepresentation, his biographer gives the history at some length; and

Digitized by Google

we think that every one who reads it must come to the conclusion, not only that the Bishop was fully justified in the course which he ultimately took, but that he erred, if anything, on the side of caution rather than precipitancy. The facts, very briefly stated, were these. In 1845 four Germans, in Lutheran orders, had been sent out by Pastor Gossner from Berlin, and laboured with some success till the mutiny, and with still greater after their return from a temporary dispersion occasioned by it. In 1864, after the death of Pastor Gossner, Bishop Cotton, finding them in great distress for want of funds, wrote to the committee at Berlin, and promoted the formation of a committee of Germans and English at Calcutta.

In 1866 a body of younger missionaries was sent out from Berlin, who quarrelled with the older ones, and brought grave charges against them which, though disproved after careful investigation, to the satisfaction both of Colonel Dalton, the Resident, and the committee at Calcutta, were believed by the Berlin Committee, who dismissed the missionaries and deprived them of their mission house and church.

On this, 7,000 of the native converts determined to remain with their old friends, to whom they owed their knowledge of the truth, and whom they loved and respected. The missionaries earnestly appealed to the Bishop to come to their aid. They desired to be received into the communion of the English Church, which they said had been the wish of Pastor Gossner for them before his death. The Bishop refused to visit them till a further reference had been made to Berlin. He was naturally anxious that some arrangement should be made for the mission becoming part of the Church, but insisted that every opportunity should be given to Mr. Ansorge, who had been sent out from Berlin, to state his case. Though the missionaries had been dismissed in November, it was not till March 16 that the Bishop came to Ranchi, to investigate the whole matter on the spot. After much patient enquiry and long deliberation, the Bishop acceded to the earnest petition of the Kôl converts, headed by their elders and teachers, to be received into the English Church.

He promised to return after Easter, to ordain their pastors and receive them formally into communion.

'When aware of this,' an eye-witness says, 'every face became radiant; and when, after having received the episcopal benediction, they sang the hymn, "Now thank we all our God," their very notes seemed replete with exultant joy.'

According to his promise, the Bishop returned after Easter, and on April 18 ordained three pastors and one catechist, and

Digitized by Google

then administered the Holy Communion to 650 communicants, Kôls, Germans, and English.

'I did not seek them,' the Bishop wrote; 'they sought me. I dare say I shall be criticized for my conduct, but the appeal made by the English residents and subscribers as well as by the natives could not be refused. Hitherto I have only been found fault with as hasty, which, as the matter has been very long in hand, is not a very just criticism. However, I must not shirk responsibility.'

And in answer to a protest from the Berlin Committee—

'I believe that when all the circumstances are fully known, my conduct will be approved by you, and I humbly trust that I have been guided by the great Head of the Church Himself.'

The mission continued to flourish, and was always an object of great interest to the Bishop. We read in his journal of seven visits paid to Ranchi and other places in the Chota Nagpore district. On the last occasion he ordained at Ranchi six priests and four deacons. Nowhere was there greater promise.

'It has been very pleasant,' is the Bishop's entry in his journal, 'to visit this mission, and to find how the missionaries labour in devotion and love for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the numerous faithful in this large district. There is distinctly a better promise of edification than I have seen elsewhere. May God in His mercy pour out the abundance of His grace on all the labourers in this portion of His harvest! It is striking to see so strong an indigenous ministry so rapidly formed.'

At a subsequent period Bishop Milman was induced, after the same careful investigation and deliberation, as in the case of the Kôls, to receive into the Church 200 Karens in Burma, who had separated themselves from the American Baptist missionaries. Till the Bishop was quite satisfied that every opportunity of return to the Baptist missionaries had been afforded, and that they were resolute and conscientious in their determination not to reconcile themselves, and in their desire to be received into the Church of England, he returned no answer to their strong and repeated appeals, nor did he accede to their request till he saw that there would be a danger, if refused, of their relapsing into unbelief.

Here again, as there could be no secular motive, no official pressure, and the movement was perfectly spontaneous, it seems to us that the Bishop erred rather in caution than precipitancy, though doubtless he was accused by the Americans of bigotry and proselytism.

We wish that our space allowed us to give any account of

Digitized by Google

the Bishop's very interesting visits to Burma, now happily removed from the Diocese of Calcutta, but then under the jurisdiction of that See. He seems to have been almost fascinated by Buddhism, that marvellous religion, as he calls it.

'There is to me always something quieter and purer, almost—if the word may be used—holier, in the traces of Buddhism than of any other heathen religion. Among the heathen precursors of the truth, I feel more and more that Sakya Muni was the nearest in character to Him Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. There is a fierceness in Islamism, a foulness in Hinduism, but a gentleness and purity, however childish, and even perhaps silly, in Buddhism, which is very attractive.'

The Bishop is speaking of Buddhism as it is found in Burma, free from the admixture of Shivaism, as in Nepal and Ceylon, and from the superstitions of China and Thibet, and he says :—

'I have more hope that the Buddhist will soon become receptive of Christianity. He has a truer conscience on the whole, a better law, a purer exemplar, than Hindu or Mahomedan ; he is free from the caste of the one, the bigotry of the other. Education, though of a scanty character, is very generally diffused. Every Burmese male can read and write.

'Their strange devotion is addressed in a sense to a non-existent being. They pray for they know not what—for nirwana, nothingness, extinction, annihilation eventually—yet they pray. They do not worship idols ; yet I believe the images of Gaudama, numberless as they are everywhere, give what Dr. Newman would call the concrete idea of the Godhead to them.

'But in their law God and man's relation to Him are absolutely wanting, and so He is wanting in their lives. The religion gave me the impression of childishness, cheerful but thoughtless childishness. It does not apparently restrain the temper or give any depth of purpose to the heart. Certainly, however, there is an amiable spirit on the whole, which makes me hope and trust that, when our missions there have got thoroughly to work, they may make more rapid progress than among the prejudices and self-satisfaction of Hindustan.'

In the article already referred to on John Stuart Mill, Bishop Milman draws a parallel between Buddhism and his philosophy. He mentions that he had seen in one of the kyounges a boy prostrated in deep devotion, and, in answer to an enquiry, had been told that he was praying. To whom ? 'Nobody.' For what ? 'Nothing.'

'The Buddhist child,' he continues, 'must pray, but he can pray to Nobody, and for Nothing. See how extremes meet.

'The ablest and wisest of philosophers cannot do without a re-

Digitized by Google

ligion, but he may have an abstract nonentity (humanity) for the object of his worship, and annihilation for the summit of his desire.'

There is another subject of great interest to which we would gladly, if space allowed, call attention: the Syrian Church in India, so lamentably disturbed by intrigues and rent by schisms, but still, in the Bishop's opinion, retaining a spring of life which, if it can only be freed from these obstacles, may pour forth abundant and fertilizing streams both on the priesthood and people of its communion. He gave it as his opinion, after careful enquiry, that Mar Athanasius was the lawful Metran.

We must not omit, however, briefly to refer to a subject of paramount importance: that of additional bishops for India and their relation to the Missionary societies. It is one on which the Bishop's recorded views ought to carry great weight. In 1873, he felt bound in conscience to offer a resolute opposition to the scheme proposed at home for the appointment and consecration of missionary bishops in Madras, 'one to hold jurisdiction over the S. P. G. clergy and their flocks, and the other over the C. M. S. clergy and flocks.' Of this the Bishop says:—

'I have heard only one expression of opinion, viz. reprobation. It seems to me to come of evil, and to be sure to lead to evil.

'A missionary bishop in another bishop's diocese seems to me an anomaly. His existence might lead probably to dangerous disputes.

'I cannot approve of a bishop nominated by a society, or of making his endowment, or rather salary, dependent on the will of a committee.

'The difficulties even in a missionary point of view are by no means insignificant.

'The English missionaries dislike the notion of a bishop who would have authority over them and not over the chaplain beside them. The natives, competent to form an opinion, dislike the idea of a bishop who would be over them and not over Europeans, except the actual missionaries. It would have a tendency also to make the native Christians a caste, which idea is even now dangerously at work, preventing the extension of Christianity.

'It is not that a territorial area is of itself an absolute necessity, but it implies that men shall not be divided according to societies, and this division is what the C. M. S. appear to insist on.

'Such division will not be obliterated, but will be more conspicuous, if a bishop is put at the head of each division, and it will be likely to gender a future schism, if continued persistently among the native Christians, inclined as they are to jealousy and imbued with party spirit.

'It is contrary to the spirit of love . . . as well as opposed to all precedents and principles of Church government.'

Digitized by Google

This particular scheme was happily averted by Bishop Milman's opposition, supported as he was by the Bishops of Madras and Bombay. But his remarks on the position of bishops dependent on societies deserve to be carefully weighed. It seems to us that of late we have been making dangerous advances in that direction. The whole subject, however, requires much more careful consideration than we can now bestow upon it.

But we must pass on to the closing scenes of this history. Mrs. Heber, writing in 1830 of the vast extent of the diocese of Calcutta and of the fatal results, says:—'Three invaluable lives have already fallen by this kind of voluntary martyrdom. Men ready to make the sacrifice will, it is hoped, through God's blessing always be found. But are such the lives that we should be heedless and unscrupulous about throwing away?' Yet another life was to be sacrificed. It was impossible to suppose that even the iron constitution of Bishop Milman could long stand the wear and tear of perpetual journeys to and fro through his vast diocese, with its attendant anxieties and responsibilities; but, humanly speaking, his life might have been prolonged for some more years, especially as a visit to England was in prospect, had he not been compelled, in the middle of his visitation of the Punjab in December 1875, to return to Calcutta to receive the Prince of Wales, and this involved a second journey to Peshawur in the following February. In this journey of 1,500 miles, which was made without stopping, and was rendered unusually trying by the state of the country, and exposure to cold and wet, and want of sufficient food, the Bishop contracted that illness which proved fatal to him. On his arrival at Peshawur, though suffering much, he could not be induced to forego any of his numerous engagements. His last official act was an address in Hindustani on Monday the 28th, at a prize-giving at the Mission Schools, when a great number of Afghan chiefs were present and crowds of strangers trading to Peshawur from Central Asia. On returning from the school he took to his bed at Sir R. Pollock's house, 'having literally worked himself to death in the service of his Divine master.' He was removed to Rawal Pindi as a more healthy place, and though at first he seemed to benefit, yet there was a relapse on March 11, and on the 15th he sank to his rest.

His last moments are thus recorded by his chaplain, the Rev. E. Jacob:—

'15th. At 7 a.m. the Bishop revived a little, and was quite conscious. On my asking him if he remembered the words, "The

Digitized by Google

eternal God is my refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms," he replied, "Yes, eternal God, refuge." I then said slowly such other verses as "God so loved the world," "I know whom I have believed," &c. Finding he was following me, I began the 130th Psalm, and he immediately took it up and said the second verse himself. I said the third verse, and the Bishop responded. I then finished the Psalm, and the Bishop said the *Gloria Patri* himself. I knelt down, said the first collect in the Visitation Service, the Lord's Prayer, and the "Grace;" the Bishop repeating the Lord's Prayer, and saying Amen after the other prayers, gently raising his hand to cover his eyes. A few minutes afterwards he was heard saying, "The creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Then looking up, he said, "When shall I be delivered from this bondage?" "Soon," was the reply. "How soon?" said the Bishop eagerly. "Very soon," was the answer, and the Bishop murmured quietly, "The glorious liberty of the children of God." Then a few words in Hindustani, and he passed quietly away.'

So passed away, in the sixty-first year of his age, and the ninth of his Episcopate, Robert Milman. His work on earth was done. So it seemed to his divine Master, and He called His faithful servant to Himself. To us, it may seem that he was cut off in the midst of his work: that he was just the man, if his life had been spared, to take a prominent part in settling the great questions which every day must assume more prominence, such as the Organization of the Native Churches, the relations of the Church to the Missionary societies, and of the different branches of the Anglican Church to each other. His wideness of view; his calmness of judgment, as well as his knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity; and his experience in his own diocese, would have made his opinions most valuable in Council. We even fancy that, if he had been spared as Metropolitan of India, the difficulties in Ceylon would never have arisen or been speedily arranged.

Sed Dis aliter visum. Still, being dead, he yet speaketh. He has left a mark in India which will not easily be effaced. He has done much to inspire others with his own spirit of zeal and love and self-sacrifice. His memory will be a rallying point. Chancellor Espin has well said that, 'wherever he passed he left religion deeper, more real, more spiritual by far, than he found it.'

In one respect at least we may see that the Bishop accomplished by his death that which he had longed for in vain during his life—the division of his diocese, by the foundation of the new sees of Lahore and Rangoon, as memorials to him. In what other respects his death may

Digitized by Google

bear fruit to the glory of God and the good of His Church, in India and the world at large, will only be fully known hereafter.

We ought not to conclude this article without saying something on the manner in which Miss Milman has discharged her task as her brother's biographer. She seems to us to have shown singular judgment and good taste, and she has produced a volume full of interest not only to those who are of an ecclesiastical turn of mind, but to the public at large. She has left her brother to speak for himself, by giving his journals *in extenso*, or carefully executed summaries of them. At times we might desire, for non-Indian readers, more detailed explanations; but, on the other hand, she deserves great praise for compressing her work into one volume. Her great desire has been to efface herself: but all who were at Calcutta during the Bishop's residence there know well how much of the success of his endeavours to break down the barriers between Europeans and natives, by his receptions at the palace, was due to his sister, and how great was the influence which 'her Holiness,' as she was called by the natives, exercised on all around her. An incidental illustration of this is given, in the effect of a threat to a native gentleman, that if he did not act as desired 'Miss Milman should be told, and he would never again be invited to the palace.'

Those who can read between the lines in the Bishop's journals can see how invaluable his sister was to him; and there are many most touching allusions to his affection for her, and his clinging to her as the one solace of his banishment from home ties and interest. 'It is rather awful to feel,' he says, 'how much we are to one another in this great wilderness.'

We doubt not but that to her the work has been a labour of love, and we trust that she will have the satisfaction of knowing that it has been the means, not only of making her brother's great qualities better known, but of kindling in others a desire to emulate his singleness of aim and devotion to the cause of God and His Church.

Digitized by Google

ART. X.—THE BURIALS BILL.

A Bill intituled an Act to Amend the Burial Laws, 1880. (*Presented by the Lord Chancellor.*)

THE change which has passed over the relations of Church and State regarding the Burials Question since our Summary for 1879 is complete. In January there was a majority in both Houses of Parliament favourable to the Church of England; and although the possible action of the Lords was ambiguous, since that body so strangely insisted on importing Lord Harrowby's proviso into the Government Bill of 1877, yet the House of Commons had never given a majority to Mr. Osborne Morgan, while the majority against him among the English members, who alone were really concerned in the controversy, was overwhelming. In January Churchmen were justly exultant at Mr. Marten's remarkable success in passing his Act. Now the Government Burials Bill, which is only Mr. Osborne Morgan's familiar production under a flimsy disguise, has passed the House of Lords, and all that can be safely predicated of its course in the Commons is the possibility that all the palliatives imported into it, against the votes of the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the Upper House, will be erased.

We have no desire to discuss the well-known schedule of objections, unanswerable as we still consider them, to the innovation. They are, shortly, (1) the violation of the compact created by the abolition of compulsory Church rates, and the consequent devolution of expense upon Churchmen while the public user of the churchyard continued; (2) the fact that, with the growth of cemeteries, the pretended grievance is moribund everywhere, and absolutely defunct in all centres of population; (3) the certainty, cynically flaunted by the Liberationists, that they are only calling for the concession as a step towards disestablishment and confiscation; and (4) the obvious process by which they will work the 'rainy-day' grievance so as to secure a lodgment inside the churches. Our narrative is addressed to that large body of Churchmen who still preserve their courage and their prescience, and to whose knowledge of human nature crotchets and sentimentalities and Utopian dreams are abhorrent; and our object is to offer to them a contribution not so much of consolation as of guiding counsel in their sore distress.

Digitized by Google

The Bill, as we have explained, was, as brought in, simply Mr. Osborne Morgan's stale old nostrum with two concessions included—made, as we willingly grant, with very excellent intentions to gratify Churchmen—and with a provision declaring that, whereas consecrated churchyards were in future to become common ground, so also should the consecrated portions of cemeteries. We conclude that the last-named extension of the scope of the measure was decided on, in imitation of the Scottish chief, who hung a thief on one side of the gate, and then felt constrained, out of regard to symmetry, to hang an honest man on the other side. What the House of Lords have done in Committee is by adopting an amendment of Lord Mount-Edgcumbe to limit the action of the measure to places which have no ready access to a cemetery (thus restoring it to the condition in which for several successive Sessions Mr. Osborne Morgan continued to present it); and by adopting another, moved by the Archbishop of York, to drop the foolish meddling with cemeteries. Against both these palliatives the Archbishop of Canterbury voted, as well as against Lord Salisbury's unsuccessful amendment to exclude burial-grounds given by private donors within sixty years of the benefactors' grants. We must confess that there were two sides to the latter suggestion. It would have snatched some brands from the burning; but the precedent of a date before which we declined to show fight might become awkward whenever Metropolitans and Diocesans may be called on to decide how far it is their duty to protest against the confiscation of our churches.

It will much shorten a repulsive narrative if we simply recite this portion of the measure as it has gone down to the House of Commons, with the amendments of Lord Mount Edgcumbe and the Archbishop of York indicated by italics. We will then pass to the more immediately interesting question of the proposed palliatives which, in the opinion of Lord Selborne and the Government, ought to make the Bill acceptable to the Church of England.

'1. After the passing of this Act any relative, friend, or legal representative, having the charge of or being responsible for the burial of a deceased person, may give forty-eight hours notice in writing plainly signed with the name and stating the address of the person giving it, in the form or to the effect of Schedule A. annexed to this Act, indorsed on the outside "Notice of Burial," to or leave at the usual place of abode of the rector, vicar, or other incumbent, or in his absence the officiating minister in charge of any parish or ecclesiastical district or place where there is no unconsecrated burial-ground or

Digitized by Google

cemetery in which the parishioners or inhabitants have rights of burial, or any person appointed by him to receive such notice, that it is intended that such deceased person shall be buried within the churchyard or graveyard of such parish or ecclesiastical district without the performance, in the manner prescribed by law, of the service for the burial of the dead according to the rites of the Church of England; and after receiving such notice no rector, vicar, incumbent, or officiating minister shall be liable to any censure or penalty, ecclesiastical or civil, for permitting any such burial as aforesaid.

'*But such power of giving notice of burial shall not apply to any consecrated portion of a burial-ground formed under the Acts fifteenth and sixteenth Victoria, chapter eighty-five, and sixteenth and seventeenth Victoria, chapter one hundred and thirty-four, of which some portion has been left unconsecrated; nor to any consecrated burial-ground in a place where one or more unconsecrated grounds are also provided under the Act twentieth and twenty-first Victoria, chapter eighty-one, section three.*'

The twelfth (originally the eleventh) clause—which is, with its accompanying schedule, intended for the relief of the clergy—is one of the increasingly many things which, as legislation becomes more and more flighty, look attractive at the first glimpse, but which wise and considerate men go on liking less the more they see of them. The clause runs as follows:—

'12. And whereas the archbishop, bishops, and clergy of the province of Canterbury in convocation assembled, in obedience to Her Majesty's Royal License and Letter of Business, bearing date respectively the fourth and sixth days of July, in the thirty-eighth year of Her Majesty's reign, did on the thirty-first day of July one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine agree (among other matters by the said Letter of Business referred to them) upon certain recommendations concerning the office of the Church of England for the burial of the dead, proposed by them to be embodied in certain altered and additional rubrics in the form set forth in Schedule (C.) to this Act annexed, and which recommendations were by them duly submitted to Her Majesty: And whereas such of the same recommendations (as are numbered 1, 3, 4, and 5, in the said Schedule C.) have also been agreed to, and submitted to Her Majesty, by the archbishop, bishops, and clergy of the province of York, in convocation assembled, in obedience to Her Majesty's Royal License and Letter of Business in like manner addressed to them: It is hereby enacted that, from and after the passing of this Act, no minister in holy orders of the Church of England shall be liable to any censure or penalty, ecclesiastical or civil, for any act done or omitted to be done by him in or concerning the burial of any deceased person in any churchyard, graveyard, or other place, provided that such act or omission would have been authorized by the recommendations set forth in the said Schedule (C.) to this Act, if the same had been embodied as rubrics in the office of the Church of England for the burial of the dead, or any of them: provided also that the word "crime" in the said

Digitized by Google

Schedule C. shall mean only an offence against the criminal law of this realm.'

SCHEDULE (C.).

'1. That the first rubric of the office for the burial of the dead stand as follows:—

'Here it is to be noted that neither the office ensuing nor the shortened office hereinafter provided is to be used for any that die unbaptized or excommunicate, or in the commission of any grievous crime, or, having laid violent hands upon themselves, have not been found to have been of unsound mind.

'2. Add the following rubric:—

'Nevertheless in cases in which neither of the aforesaid offices may be used, it shall not be unlawful for the minister, at the request of the kindred or friends of the deceased, to use, after the body has been laid into the earth, prayers taken from the Book of Common Prayer and portions of Holy Scripture, approved by the ordinary, so that they be not part of the Order for the Burial of the Dead, nor of the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion.

'3. In the rubric, "after they are come into the church, shall be read one or both of these psalms following,"

'For "read" substitute "said or sung."

'4. At the end of the burial office, after "The grace of our Lord, &c.," add:—

'If occasion require, the words "Lord have mercy, &c.," the Lord's Prayer, the prayer *Almighty God with whom, &c.*, and the collect following, may, at the discretion of the minister, be said in the church after the lesson.

'5. ¶ On the request or with the consent of the kindred or friends, it shall be lawful for the minister to use only the following service at the burial:—the three sentences of the Scriptures to be said or sung on meeting the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard; and after they are come into the church one or both of these psalms following, Psalm xxxix. and Psalm xc.; then the Lesson, 1 Cor. xv. 20.

'When they come to the grave, while the corpse is made ready to be laid into the earth, the priest shall say, or the priest and clerks shall sing, the sentences beginning "Man that is born of, &c.," ending with the words "Fall from Thee." Then shall follow the words "Lord have mercy, &c.," the Lord's Prayer, and "The grace of our Lord."

'6. ¶ Whenever either of the two foregoing services be used it shall be lawful for the officiating minister, at his discretion, to allow the use of hymns and anthems in the church or at the grave.

'7. Further, it shall be lawful for the minister, at the request or with the consent in writing of the kindred or friends of the deceased, to permit the corpse to be committed to the grave without any service, hymn, anthem, or address of any kind.

The origin of the suggestion—to go back to an almost pre-

Digitized by Google

historic period—is found in that varied and often very amusing repertory of ingenious suggestions, the Reports of the Ritual Commission. Of whatever weaknesses this august conclave may be arraigned, it is certain that one of them was not any maidenly shyness in pushing the powers contained in the order of its reference to the uttermost. In fact, till the second Bradlaugh Committee had reported, we thought the Ritual Commission stood alone in its heroic assumption of gratuitous trouble.

The Royal directions given to the Ritual Commission ran in these words:—

'Whereas it has been represented unto Us that Differences of Practice have arisen from varying Interpretations put upon the Rubrics, Orders, and Directions for regulating the Course and Conduct of Public Worship, the Administration of the Sacraments, and the other Services contained in the Book of Common Prayer, according to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland, and more especially with reference to the Ornaments used in the Churches and Chapels of the said United Church and the Vestments worn by the Ministers thereof at the time of their Ministrations:

'And whereas it is expedient that a full and impartial Inquiry should be made into the Matters aforesaid with the view of explaining or amending the said Rubrics, Orders, and Directions, so as to secure general Uniformity of Practice in such Matters as may be deemed essential.

. . . . . .

'We do hereby enjoin you, or any Ten or more of you, to make diligent inquiry into all and every the matters aforesaid, and to report thereupon from time to time as to you, or any Ten or more of you, may appear to be most expedient, having regard not only to the said Rubrics, Orders, and Directions contained in the said Book of Common Prayer, but also to any other laws or customs relating to the matters aforesaid, with power to suggest any alterations, improvements, or amendments with respect to such matters, or any of them, as you, or any Ten or more of you, may think fit to recommend.'

It needed some ingenuity to set up these directions, referring, as they exclusively do, to the varying interpretations of the rubrics in contrast to the text of the Prayer-Book, as warrant for the innovations, not merely on the rubrics, but in the actual matter of the Burial Service, which the Commission recommended in its Fourth Report, issued without a date, but belonging to 1870.

'Here it is to be noted, that the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves; but it shall be lawful for the Minister, on sufficient cause, to read one or both of the Psalms following, together

Digitized by Google

with one of the appointed lessons, and the four sentences appointed to be said while the corpse is made ready to be laid into the earth, concluding with the Lord's Prayer and the Grace at the end of the Office. Provided always, that the Service thus allowed be not used without the permission of the Ordinary; but that if from want of sufficient time such permission cannot be obtained, then the Minister shall notify in writing, within seven days, to the Ordinary, the use of the shortened service, and the reasons for his having so used it.'

Thus was the suggestion—which, speaking for ourselves, we have never ceased to regret—of second-class and third-class burial services turned loose upon the too excitable minds of fervid Churchmen; and it naturally bore fruit in the ritual debates and conclusions of the two Convocations, with what varying results in the two provinces the last extract which we have given from the Bill cannot help revealing.

The Canterbury recommendation, as is well known, formed part of a schedule of amended rubrics appended to the so-called Bishop of London's draft Bill, for establishing a new Parliamentary method of procedure in regard to Convocational suggestions for future alterations of the Prayer-Book. It is incontestable that Convocation solely and simply put this and all its other projected rubrics forward as part of, and inseparably combined with, and depending upon, the project taken in its absolute integrity.

Thus we see that Lord Selborne's Bill, under the plea of respect for Convocation and in order, as it professes, to reconcile the Church to the Burials Bill, compasses two results:—

I. The Bill wrenches a fragment of the Convocational suggestions from its moorings on the chance of its drifting into harbour by the favouring gales of merely Parliamentary enactment, thus imposing upon the Church hereafter conditions diametrically opposed to those which animated the tentative recommendation to Parliament of that whole body of revised rubrics.

II. Under the same plea of respect for Convocation, the Bill calls upon the entire province of York to fly in the face of and repudiate the recommendations solemnly made by the Convocation of York on a matter as to which that Convocation is interested to the same degree as that of Canterbury, and in all respects stands on an equal footing of authority, prestige, and influence.

So much must be said upon the genesis of clause 12. What are we to think of its subject-matter? The main pretext brought forward by its advocates is the relief it is said to minister to the clergyman's conscience, often and sorely

Digitized by Google

burdened by being called on to use the words of Christian burial over the unhappy creature who has lived an unchristian life. The grievance is no doubt real, and the intention of the remedy meritorious. But what is the process proposed for attaining the relief?

We pass over the curiously limited expression 'not unlawful,' importing, as that appears to do, an impression of not quite perfect legality into the recommendation which it prefaces. The point on which we must insist is that the forms of inferior service are only to be used one of them 'at the request of' and the other 'on the request or with the consent of kindred or friends,' whatever, as Lord Cairns cleverly enquired, that most ambiguous expression may mean. Is it not trifling with common sense to contend that in the case of the least deserving of mankind, and in proportion to the demerits of the deceased, the obstinacy, for obvious reasons, of the 'friends' must not always be at its maximum, and their determination most resolute to resist a deserved and truthful, and therefore tenfold stinging, censure being passed upon his memory by the adoption by the clergyman of the inferior forms of burial service? We leave to the imagination of our most matter-of-fact reader to conceive the trouble and distress of the conscientious clergyman bargaining in vain to extort from boon companion or kept mistress some 'request' or 'consent' which should convey the power of uttering over the open grave the service which, in comparison with the normal one, would intentionally be the expression of constructive and retrospective excommunication.

Personally, too, we entertain strong feelings upon the practical undesirability—to say nothing of the theoretical and theological objections to the scheme—of recognizing any inferior service to be used over the unbaptized. The Church of England is not so sure of its hold over the masses in the way of persuading them to bring their children to the font, as to make it safe to abandon the connection between Christian Baptism and Christian Burial.

It would be mere pedantry to contend that the expressions of the new service are intended to have a totally different scope from that of the old and normal one; and that the danger which we have forecast would therefore be imaginary. The ignorant, the careless, and the godless portion of mankind, with whom we are dealing, would care very little for the words of the service in themselves, even if they grasped them, compared with the visible fact that they had brought the parson in his surplice to the graveyard to say some words over

Digitized by Google

the unbaptized child. In fact, if we compare the two proposed classes of ungodly burials and of unbaptized burials, we shall be driven to the conviction that in the case where there ought to be no searching of hearts over the new words there will be plenty, and where there ought to be plenty there will be none.

The argument tersely put by Lord Cairns that Parliament by closing with clause 12 would really tie up and not unloose the hands of Convocation in its work of progressive reform could only be met by Lord Selborne with some ponderous sarcasms.

We have, we think, offered considerations which might lead the most sanguine advocate of the Lord Chancellor's Bill to acknowledge that there were solid foundations for the apprehensions that, after all, clause 12 would be to the Church of England ἄδωρον δῶρον.

The other intended safeguard, or concession, or compromise, contained in the Bill is the proviso that the miscellaneous burial services, of which our churchyards are hereafter to be the scene, should at least be 'Christian.' On this, rather than trust to any words of our own, we prefer to adopt those sentences of the Bishop of Peterborough which so undeservedly brought down upon him the denunciation of his Metropolitan, when uttered in the House of Lords upon the third reading of the Bill. In order, however, that our readers may have the advantage of seeing how the Convocation clause strikes a most acute mind, we shall include in our quotation, even at the risk of making it somewhat lengthy, the criticisms which the Bishop has felt it his duty to offer upon that portion also of the measure.

'He was anxious to point out the two important additions which the Government had made in the Bill, as compared with that which was commonly known as Osborne Morgan's Bill, and in doing so he should express his gratitude to the Noble and Learned Lord on the woolsack for the endeavour to do justice to the feelings of the clergy in the matter which had marked his introduction and management of the Bill. The additions to which he referred were the provision or safeguard for Christian services in the churchyard, and the other was the concession to the clergy known as the Convocation clause. As to the safeguard, which he did not underrate, it had this value and no more, that it was a recognition on the part of the Legislature that the services in the churchyards of the Church of England should still be Christian. He felt confident that the clause would encounter opposition from two bodies in the country who were clamorous for the Bill: one a large party who hated the Church of England a little more than they loved Christianity; the other, a smaller but more resolute and growing party, who loved Christianity a little more than

Digitized by Google

they hated the Church of England. It was utterly impossible to frame in an Act of Parliament a working definition of what was a Christian service. The clause rested the definition, not on the nature of the service, but of the profession or denomination of the person using the service, and the result would be that the service might be used by any person who, for the occasion and for the purpose, professed himself a Christian. The clause was inoperative, and he believed it would vanish from the Bill. With regard to the Convocation clause, the matter would stand thus: That, whereas under the existing Burial Law of the Church of England there were three classes of persons over whom its services might not be read, under the proposed new rubric a clergyman would be allowed to read over those persons one or other of two alternative services that were scheduled in the Bill. It would enable a minister at his pleasure, subject to the consent of the friends of the deceased, to use what he had heard called a "second or third class funeral service." It did not touch the real grievance of the clergy at all; and, even if it did, look at the dangerous price they were called upon to pay for it. If it passed in the form in the Bill, the necessary and inevitable result must be that the clergyman would be compelled to give a certificate of character of every one of his parishioners who was buried in the churchyard. If he read the full service he thereby declared that the man was worthy of it; if not, he thereby declared that the man was unworthy of it. In other words, the clergy would be obliged to classify the dead in their parishes. That was a painful position in which to place them. At a meeting of the clergy of his diocese the clause was unanimously condemned, and a desire expressed for its removal from the Bill. He should be told that it expressed the wish of Convocation. (Hear, hear.) Resolutions to that effect, in which he himself had agreed, had no doubt been passed by Convocation, but they were passed by Convocation for one purpose, and as embodied in the clause were introduced into the Bill for another and different purpose. They were passed, not that they should form part of a Burials Bill, but to prevent a Burials Bill being carried. They were introduced to give relief in the case of unbaptized Dissenters. The necessity for that relief was gone, for the unbaptized could now have their own services, or the services of the Church of England of the inferior character as they pleased. And, further, Convocation strongly deprecated these rubrics being legalized until certain alterations in the relations between Parliament and Convocation had taken place. The clergy were deeply wounded by the Bill; but he could say of his own diocese, as of himself, that if the Bill were passed, they would loyally carry it into effect. (Hear, hear.) He, however, appealed to the Noble and Learned Lord on the woolsack to postpone the application of the Bill for some period after its passing. He was satisfied that in the interest, not of the Church or of the Nonconformists, but in the interest of peace and goodwill, it would be desirable to allow a few months', perhaps he might even say a year's, delay between the passing and the application of the Act. He felt certain that in this matter the bishops and clergy would

Digitized by Google

be true to their ordination vow, and promote peace and goodwill among those intrusted to their charge. (Hear, hear.)'

The Lords—a body who are always more chary of dividing merely by way of protest than the Lower House—allowed the third reading of the Bill to pass unchallenged. The lamentable condition of matters which led to this conclusion was expounded in a speech of Lord Beaconsfield, in which some home truths are told in language which is not likely to be easily forgotten. Again, we shall inflict a long quotation upon our readers; but we feel the more compelled to do so because we have noticed some very unfair representations given of this speech. We are as far as possible from desiring to hold Lord Beaconsfield's brief in vindication of his advocacy of Church interests. There is one Church speech of his, to which we need not more particularly refer, which stands almost unmatched for impetuous unwisdom. But it is the reverse of liberal in the grammatical, whatever it may be in the political, sense of the word to proclaim the chief of one of the great parties *caput lupinum*, when we remember that his administration was marked by the substantial increase of the Episcopate, by the reconsideration of the Endowed Schools and Elementary Education Acts, and by steady resistance both to the Burials Bill and to the one for legalizing unlawful marriages. Lord Beaconsfield's speech on the third reading of the Burials Bill is marked by its author's characteristic phraseology; but its matter is a strong statement of the Church's wrong, while the critic must be very thin-skinned or captious who is, or who pretends to be, hurt at the orator's irrepressible but good-humoured oddness of expression:—

'The Bill is one of very great difficulty, and the subject is rendered more perplexing under the disadvantage of the opinions given by the Right Rev. and Most Rev. Prelates, which are so contrary one to the other. I have not risen to oppose the third reading, though my opinion is unchanged as to its character. I think it is an unjust and an unwise Bill, and I have not heard any arguments yet which have shown me that all the reasons which have been applied to the churchyards do not equally apply to the churches themselves. I have heard remarks on the subject, but I have heard no arguments against that view of the question. We have been told in the course of the debate something in reference to the Church of Ireland. It was said you disestablished the Church of Ireland, and that was a very much greater measure than this, and that although the Roman Catholics had for some years the privilege of using the parish churchyards, they never urged any claim to the possession of the churches. There may be various reasons for that course. Whatever may be said of the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, no one can impute to it a

Digitized by Google

want of good taste; and the Protestant churches of Ireland are not such as those who appreciate the beauty of holiness would be particularly anxious to possess. (A laugh.) That, probably, was one of the reasons why the Roman Catholic population of Ireland never laid any claim to those churches. But that will not apply to the churches of England, which are beautiful and made more beautiful every year by the devotion and the taste of the wealthy congregations of this country; but whether that devotion and taste will continue after this Bill passes is, I think, very doubtful. This Bill appears to me to be unjust for many reasons, and particularly for one primary one which no person has yet grappled with. Every ordained clergyman of the Church of England will be obliged to open the churchyards to all sects, while he is not to enjoy the use of their graveyards for his parishioners in the same parish; and I cannot understand how such inequality could be brought forward in a Bill of this nature, which assumes that it is founded on justice and equality. (Hear.) This is not only an unjust Bill, but an unwise one. We hear much about God's acre, and there are those who have called upon the House not to sanction the desecration of God's acre by allowing it to be used by people whose religious opinions do not agree with theirs. Then, again, there are others who complain of the great hardship they suffer from not being permitted to have a portion of God's acre. But though I trust that the hour may never arrive when the recognition of a Supreme Governor of this world will cease to be the profession of the inhabitants of this country, still, my Lords, I cannot but feel that this institution of what is called God's acre is one which is really not adapted to the country which we inhabit, the times in which we live, and the spirit of the age. What I should like to see would be a settlement of this question by the shutting up of all God's acres throughout the country. I think it would be a much wiser step if we were to take steps for furnishing every community with a capacious and ample cemetery placed in a situation in which, while it would meet all the requirements of the society for which it was intended, it would exercise no prejudicial influence on the public health. I support the Bill with great regret, and only because, from what I have observed in this House, I am convinced that opposition would be fruitless, and fruitless opposition is a kind of opposition which I never care much to encourage. If it be possible to fight what is called the battle of the Church at other times, *it is quite impossible to stand up for a privilege which the ordained clergy of this country enjoy, and which, in my opinion, is exercised for the welfare and benefit of the country, when you find that you are opposed in such attempts by the prelates of the Church of England.* (Hear.) *When the two Most Rev. Prelates and at least half of the Episcopal Bench support a particular course, you cannot persuade the country that in resisting a proposal sanctioned by such high authority you are actuated by any but party or factious motives.* I cannot but express my regret that this Bill should have ever been introduced, or that there should have been even any necessity to have recourse to such legislation. It is in my mind legislation which is opposed to the

Digitized by Google

circumstances in which we live. I think the direction in which we ought to have moved would have been to shut all these churchyards and graveyards, and to have assisted the Government in some adequate proposal which would have furnished the country with cemeteries in which none of these painful controversies could have occurred, and which would have conduced to the preservation of the health and welfare of the country.'

The Bill is in the House of Commons, awaiting its second reading, and notice of its rejection has been given by Mr. Beresford Hope. The members of the Lower House who consider the Bill to be both unjust and unwise would have failed in their duty if they had not at this last moment resolved upon making their final protest. Divisions which may not be possible in the Lords are often indispensable in the Commons. But no one can be sanguine enough to anticipate successful resistance. As we have indicated at the beginning of this article, any changes which may be made in the House of Commons will far too probably be in the direction of striking out the Lords' amendments, if not even the Government's own Convocational clause. We must face the anticipation that the Bill will take its place upon the statute book of 1880; and then the Church of England will feel like the daughter of Œdipus, stung and roused by the wrong of that Burials Act promulgated by the new Government of her native land:

> ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν
> ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;
> οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ
> οὔτ' αἰσχρὸν οὔτ' ἄτιμόν ἐσθ', ὁποῖον οὐ
> τῶν σῶν τε κἀμῶν οὐκ ὄπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν.
> καὶ νῦν τί τοῦτ' αὖ φασι πανδήμῳ πόλει
> κήρυγμα θεῖναι τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀρτίως;
> ἔχεις τι κεἰσήκουσας; ἢ σε λανθάνει
> πρὸς τοὺς φίλους στείχοντα τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά;

In quietness and in confidence now, as at many another crisis, will lie the strength of the Church of England: and also most emphatically in a retentive memory. We most earnestly dissuade our friends from gratifying its enemies either by raving and cursing at her calamities, or crouching down in despair among the potsherds. But the wise and dignified course remains to the Church of treasuring in her silent mind the remembrance of how she had been cruelly used by the State, on whose justice, if not mercy, she had the right to rely, and that her natural leaders and protectors uncourageously abetted the spoilers in a work against which they might at least have raised that warning and that com-

Digitized by Google

forting voice, which in any other order of men charged with the responsibilities of leading would have been a foregone conclusion.

The Bill still leaves us one resource in the future: namely, the constitution of burial-grounds for the exclusive use of the Church under special trusts; and no legal impediment, we venture to say, stands in the way of these being consecrated. So long as the private burial-grounds of Dissenters are not interfered with—and it would be a very short-sighted and an unjust policy which proposed to touch them—these Church graveyards must equally claim the protection of the law.

As for the present behaviour of the clergy, we have only a single counsel to offer, but we present the advice with a conviction of its importance which we cannot exaggerate. Smarting as they do under the wrong, let them resolve to take that share in working the Act which its provisions may impose upon them with the most scrupulous courtesy. Nothing will more effectually baffle the designs of the Liberationists than such demeanour. As for the rest, let them keep their powder dry, and be wary in choosing their leaders.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Primacy of S. Peter demonstrated from the Liturgy of the Greco-Russian Church. With an Appendix containing Several Documents. By the Rev. C. TONDINI DE QUARENGHI, Barnabite. (London and Derby: Richardson, 1879.)

THE title of this bulky pamphlet, originally issued in French so far back as 1867, usefully illustrates the entire loss of the historical sense, and of the power of appreciating evidence, which has befallen Roman theologians since they finally broke with the past in 1870.

For, in the first place, the testimonies which Father Tondini has accumulated are one and all outside his promised limits, for not a single one of them is to be found in the *Liturgy* of the Greco-Russian Church; since they all come from much less ancient or important office-books. This is no quibble, but a very weighty objection. For no such ambiguity of use in regard to the word 'Liturgy' prevails in the East as does in the West. Here in England, for instance, the whole Book of Common Prayer is frequently styled the 'Liturgy,' and such is its chief title in more than one translation; so that it would be hypercritical to base an objection on any unscientific use of the term. But throughout the Greco-Russian Church, 'Liturgy' denotes the Missal alone, and is rigidly confined to that

Digitized by Google

meaning. The true sense, then, of Father Tondini's title-page is that he proposes to adduce evidence from (*a*) the Liturgy of S. James, (*b*) the Liturgy of S. Basil the Great, (*c*) the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, the three rites still of authority in the cited communion, and weighty in proportion to their ancient prevalence and eminent origin. But it is a fact well known to every student of Liturgies that not one solitary tittle of evidence in favour of the Petrine claims can be discovered in them, nor even in the old Roman Missal itself; while, as regards the three rites now under consideration, there is no mention of either S. Peter or of the Roman Church in any of them. Whatever Father Tondini has to offer us will thus not be from the Liturgy, but from writings of a very much later date, of far less sacred character and authority amongst the Greeks, and consequently, in respect of attesting a continuous belief, of very much weaker value.

In the second place, he entirely fails to see that no amount of passages of the sort, however forcibly worded, can go one step towards 'demonstrating the Primacy of S. Peter.' To do that, one kind of evidence only could be adequate, and that is historical proof, either from Scripture itself, or from authentic documents of isapostolic date, that S. Peter did, as a matter of fact, exercise not a mere honorary priority, but a magisterial jurisdiction over the Primitive Church. But Father Tondini knows as well as we do that no trace, however faint, of any such evidence is producible. All that he could really prove, at best, by his citations, assuming them to mean all that he lays on them, is that a number of Greek writers, who range in date between A.D. 720 and 920, regarded S. Peter as he does; and that the Greek Church, by embodying their compositions in its public offices, formally affirms their opinion. But of what value is testimony to an historical and legal matter (such as S. Peter's primacy must be, in any reasonable view), which is seven hundred years later than the alleged fact? What credit would Father Tondini allow to a group of German writers in the present year, who, without professing to have found any fresh documentary evidence, should suddenly allege that Frederick Barbarossa, the German King who bore the title of Roman Emperor seven centuries ago, exercised actual sovereign rights over Alexius Comnenus of Constantinople, Philip Augustus of France, and Henry II. of England, and was recognized by them as their lord paramount? The third criticism that we have to make is that there is a certain implication made, though not expressly, by adducing both the Greek and the Slavonic epithets of S. Peter in the Oriental offices, that two parallel and independent testimonies to the same truth are thereby brought forward. No doubt, on the very first page of the treatise, the actual fact is mentioned, and repeated on page 6, that the Russian service-books are mere *translations* of the Greek ones; but we cannot see the utility of setting both down in a pamphlet intended not for Russian but for English readers, who are likely to know Greek rather than Slavonic, unless the aim be to leave on untrained minds the impression that the evidence is exactly double its real amount. Fourthly, whatever

Digitized by Google

be the weight attributable to the quotations themselves, Father Tondini is placed in this difficulty, that he cannot allege them to represent a continuous and unbroken Oriental tradition, simply for this reason, that the epithets cannot be traced up into the great Eastern Fathers, to say nothing of Scripture, as their source. If he could show that the hymnographers of the *Menæa* had but given rhythmical form to language already used by Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and others of that era, and were thus handing down a tradition, that would have been valid so far; but he cannot, and knows that he cannot. Fifthly, the very late date of the cited hymns, belonging, as we have said, to the period included between the eighth and the tenth century, has another very important bearing on the controversy. We mean that although the actual schism of East and West was not consummated till 1054, yet the two Churches had been drifting apart from early in the eighth century, and the Roman Pope had long ceased to exercise even any such influence in the Eastern dioceses as had been accorded to him when the relations of Latin and Greek Christendom had been closer. And it is hence certain that the Greek hymnographers of that era never intended to hint any reference to the Roman Chair by their panegyrics of S. Peter, and so the plea of modern departure by the Easterns from the true original meaning of their own office-books, brought against them by Father Tondini, falls to the ground at once, especially as the hymnographers were all bound by Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon, which alleges the Roman Primacy to have been a mere human gift on civil grounds.

When we come to examine the actual titles and epithets of S. Peter, of which there are forty-three cited, we find that fifteen in no way imply any Primacy whatever, even honorary. These are (1) 'Rock,' (2) 'Rock not to be confounded,' (3) 'Rock of the Church,' (4) 'Rock of the Faith,' (5) 'Foundation,' (6) 'Foundation of the Faith,' (7) 'Basis of the Church,' (8) 'Foundation of the Church,' (9) 'Immovable Basis of dogmas,' (10) 'Shepherd of Christ,' (11) 'Stay of the Church,' (12) 'Sure Repository of the Kingdom,' (13) 'Keybearer of Grace,' (14) 'Keybearer of the Kingdom of Heaven,' (15) 'Seat of the Faith.' No *comparison* is instituted in any of these, and accordingly they are not evidence for the matter in hand. In five others, (16) 'The Supreme foundation of the Apostles,' (17), (18) 'The Supreme,' (19) 'The Supreme of the Disciples,' (20) 'Supreme of the Apostles,' (21) 'The most Supreme of the Apostles,' (22) 'The first most Supreme,' Father Tondini has (despite his reclamations) falsified the rendering, for the word which stands as 'Supreme' in all these cases is the Greek κορυφαῖος, which never bears that meaning, but simply denotes a 'leader,' or 'head of a list or row,' its most usual import being the chief singer in a chorus, who is certainly not invested with supreme authority over his fellow-singers. The true Greek for 'Supreme,' ὑπέρατος, is not used of S. Peter; and appeal to the Slavonic, which is a mere translation, is useless. (23) and (24) are 'The Divine Coryphæus' and 'Coryphæus of the Apostles,' the very same word, where Father Tondini has changed his

Digitized by Google

rendering on the ground of a variation in the Slavonic translation for these two. Three more epithets are (25) 'Protothrone,' (26) 'Protothrone of the Disciples,' and (27) 'Protothrone of the Apostles.' Now, these *are* words which denote a Primacy, but they exclude a *Supremacy*, whereas Father Tondini means that, and nothing less, when speaking of a Primacy (pages 1 and 4). And the reason is that the phrase 'first throne' implies the existence of the eleven other thrones, on which those who are to be seated (S. Matt. xix. 28) are the colleagues and co-assessors of its occupant, not his mere inferiors—such as those Roman bishops now who pride themselves on the title of 'Assistants at the Pontifical Throne'—but his equals in authority, even though junior in rank. Title (28) is, according to Father Tondini, 'Set over the Church.' This is another mistranslation. The Greek is προστάτης ἐκκλησίας, which means *President* of the Church, and is a word which denotes a democratic, not a monarchical, office; as we learn from Plato, who speaks of the revolution which had taken place in some cities by the usurpation of the chief citizens, as being 'a change from President to Tyrant,' μεταβολὴ ἐκ προστατοῦ ἐπὶ τύραννον (*Rep.* 565 D). (29) and (30) belong to the same category—'Presiding over the Church,' and 'Presiding over the Apostles,'—where the Greek is πρόεδρος, *i.e.* 'chairman,' again a title of precedency amongst equals. Next are (31) and (32) 'Prince of the College of the Disciples,' and 'Standing first in the College of the Apostles.' Here, too, more is given to the Greek word ἔξαρχος than it will fairly bear. *Princeps* is an adequate translation: but *prince* is not, for it has got to mean a great deal more than its etymon did. And ἔξαρχος is merely the equivalent of κορυφαῖος, which we have had already, and is used, too, like it, for the leader of a chorus. 'Standing first' is πρωτοστάτης, a word which is used of S. Paul in Acts xxiv. 5, by his accusers, and translated 'ringleader' by the Authorized Version, and 'author' by the Douai Version: so here priority of order is all that can be got out of that term. Title (33) is 'The chosen from amongst the disciples.' And here Father Tondini has for once slightly weakened the original, which is ὁ πρόκριτος τῶν μαθητῶν, which denotes 'chosen *before* the disciples,' *i.e.* the first person selected for Apostolic office by Christ, a point ruled by Scripture, and therefore not in dispute, nor helped in any degree by such inferior testimony. (34) is the same word πρόκριτος, but now rendered 'Chosen among all.' Title (35) is again a mistranslation: Father Tondini makes it 'First in rank.' The Greek is πανάριστος, 'all-best,' a *moral*, not a magisterial or a nobiliary, epithet; while in (36) 'First of the Apostles,' ὁ πρῶτος τῶν Ἀποστόλων, we get back to the bare Scriptural fact of the order of the names in the Synoptic lists; and in (37) 'First chief of the Apostles,' we have simply the same idea over again, as the Greek is τῶν Ἀποστόλων προεξάρχων, which means simply 'beginning before' or 'going before,' again denoting priority in time. A fresh notion appears in the two next titles (38) 'Doctor of the Apostles,' and (39) 'The leader of the Apostles,' where the same Greek word καθηγητής stands for both, and plainly means that S. Peter, by declaring Our Lord's Messiahship,

Digitized by Google

either *went before* the others in his confession, or taught them the truth by it; again a Scriptural fact, not strengthened in any degree by such testimony as a late hymn. Epithet (40) is 'The overseer of the Son of God,' the word being that commonest of titles ὁ ἐπίσκοπος. But to make it mean what Father Tondini wants, the context should run thus: 'Overseer *of the Apostles*,' exactly what we do *not* find. (41) is 'The chief of the theologians,' literally, 'the highest summit of theologians,' ἡ κορυφαία τῶν θεολόγων ἀκρότης, again a vague complimentary epithet which proves nothing, but in all probability is intended to point to the fact referred to above under (38) and (39). We are reduced by this process of analysis to the two remaining epithets, which really seem to go some little way towards making Father Tondini's point. They are (42) 'Chief of Pastors of the rational sheep,' ἀρχιποίμην τῶν λογικῶν προβάτων; and (43) 'Sovereign shepherd of all the Apostles.' On these we have simply to remark that there is no definite article in the passage where the former is used; so that it need not mean more than '*a* chief shepherd,' &c.: while, even if it do mean more, it settles nothing as to the degree or kind of difference in rank implied by it. And as regards the second, which is definite enough, Father Tondini demolishes it himself in a note upon it, wherein he confesses (*a*) that it is from a spurious sermon falsely ascribed to S. Chrysostom, (*b*) that even in that sermon the words run, not in the least as the Slavonic does, but thus: 'The faithful Apostle of the Lord of all;' and (*c*) that the book in which it occurs is of lower rank and authority than the regular service-books. We have thus taken the forty-three epithets on their individual merits, and shown that they are of no value for Father Tondini's purpose; and are therefore excused from reviewing that part of his pamphlet which consists of replies to objections, though we may admit that he has scored a point or two against the *Union Chrétienne*, albeit defeated by it on most of the issues between them. But as Father Tondini knows that the whole Roman claim is that of a Divine Charter from Christ Himself recorded in the Gospels, he knows perfectly well that even if every one of the forty-three epithets of S. Peter were as strong as the last, and more authentic, they could not, as being mere expressions of human praise, and that comparatively modern, so much as gloss the charter itself; and consequently all he has done for hard-headed people is to force on their attention the fact that no such titles are in that charter, and therefore that they are null and void, as bestowed by persons with no authority to confer them. We cannot respect Father Tondini's understanding, if he think his pamphlet serious argument; we cannot respect his ethical standard, if, knowing the true logical value of his work, he offer it as serious argument to others.

S. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome in the Earlier part of the Third Century. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. Second and Greatly Enlarged Edition. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)

THIS new edition (or, rather, new work) will be generally welcomed. The learned Bishop of Lincoln has here replied to all that has been

Digitized by Google

written on the subject of S. Hippolytus since the first edition appeared, and has added the Greek text, with a translation and notes, of that part of the treatise of the Bishop of Portus on 'All Heresies,' which relates to the history of the Church of Rome in the earlier part of the third century. Our readers will remember the controversial value of the writings of S. Hippolytus against the theory of the Development of Christian Doctrine, and against the Papal claims of Supremacy and Infallibility. Equally valuable is the historical evidence, here adduced incidentally, that the state of the Roman Church in the earlier Christian centuries was very different from the imaginary picture drawn of it by M. Renan in his late Hibbert Lectures in London.

The Early History of the Athanasian Creed. By G. D. W. Ommanney, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1880.)

Some years ago Mr. Ommanney entered the lists against Professor Swainson and Mr. Ffoulkes, and published a valuable little book containing a most thorough and searching examination of their theories on the formation and publication of the Athanasian Creed. He has now followed this up by a second volume, which lies before us, containing a considerable amount of fresh evidence which he has discovered, bearing on the date of that Creed, and derived from early commentaries and manuscripts, which seems to furnish him with a most convincing reply to Professor Lumby, who asks us to believe that the Creed, as we know it, is formed by the union of two separate and independent compositions, of very different dates, and a no less crushing refutation of the latest phase of Dr. Swainson's theory, as given in his work on 'the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds,' viz., that the Quicunque grew up gradually, and 'was completed in the province of Rheims between the years 860 and 870' (p. 448).

This new volume from Mr. Ommanney's pen is entitled *The Early History of the Athanasian Creed.* It is at present the last word in the controversy (although we can hardly suppose that it will be long allowed to remain the last), and it is satisfactory to find that on all the more important points, such as date and country, our author is at one with Waterland, although most of the evidence here brought forward is based upon recent discoveries, and drawn from documents wholly unknown when Waterland's work was written. There are, of course, some points in regard to which the nineteenth century reverses the judgment of the eighteenth. For example, Mr. Ommanney (and almost all critics will agree with him in this) entirely gives up the old view that the Commentary of 'Fortunatus' is the work of Venantius Fortunatus, the author of an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. But, on the whole, we rise from the study of his work with an increased respect for the learning and soundness of judgment exhibited by the great Archdeacon of Middlesex in his *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, and a renewed conviction that his work will long remain a standard one, in spite of the fierce assault that has been made against it by Dr. Swainson and others.

The most important part of Mr. Ommanney's book, as it seems to us, is his account of the Early Commentaries on the Creed, three

Digitized by Google

of which are printed in the Appendix, it is believed, for the first time. If the editor is correct in the dates to which he assigns them (and he brings forward strong arguments in favour of his conclusions), the composition of these Commentaries furnishes absolute proof, not only that the Creed existed some two centuries before the date to which Professors Swainson and Lumby would assign it, but that it was even then a work of repute and considerable antiquity, and the theories of the Cambridge professors, highly ingenious as they were, may be said to be completely exploded and out of date. The Commentaries to which special attention is drawn are four in number, entitled the Paris Commentary, the Troyes, the Oratorian, and the Bouhier, the names being given from the former possessors of the manuscripts, or the libraries in which they were discovered. Of these Commentaries the first is an independent work, and stands quite by itself; the last two are closely connected with each other, the Bouhier being apparently drawn from the Oratorian, while the Troyes Commentary seems to be founded on the famous one already known that is ascribed in the Milan manuscript to Fortunatus. The date of these various works must be conjectured from internal evidence, as the oldest manuscripts containing them are assigned to the tenth century, and the result at which Mr. Ommanney arrives after a careful sifting of the facts is that the Paris Commentary was composed 'not earlier than the seventh nor later than the ninth century;' that the Oratorian was drawn up soon after the Sixth General Council, at the close of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century; the Bouhier shortly after, and the Troyes between 649 and 680, while the Commentary of Fortunatus must be assigned to a still earlier date, before the rise of the Monothelite controversy. Thus, if Mr. Ommanney is right in his conclusions, the discovery of these Commentaries, besides furnishing absolute proof of the existence of the Creed before the days of Charles the Great has removed a formidable objection that was often brought against its antiquity. If, it has been urged, the Creed be really a work of the fifth century, how is it possible to account for the fact that no commentary earlier than Bruno's of the eleventh century can be shown, with the single exception of that ascribed to Fortunatus, the date of which is disputed. There was certainly some weight in this objection, but it is now completely answered. Fresh manuscripts of the Commentary of Fortunatus have been discovered *without* the clauses quoted from Alcuin in the Milan manuscript, and the objections to its early date are completely disposed of in Mr. Ommanney's work, while, as we have seen, evidence is brought forward to show that this Commentary did not stand alone. 'I have shown,' writes Mr. Ommanney, 'that there are grounds for believing that in the *seventh* century, including of course Fortunatus's exposition, there were extant at least two Commentaries on the Athanasian Creed; in the *eighth* at least four.' And again further, he adds with great truth that—

'From the fact that the Creed was in the seventh century the text-book of at least two expositions, and those too of a somewhat elaborate nature, it follows that even at that early period it was a well-known, widely-received, and approved document, and consequently it must have been

Digitized by Google

the product of an earlier age. Commentaries are not written upon new and unknown and unappreciated works, but upon those which have received the sanction of time and use, and of general esteem, and of the authority of the Church.'

A still further evidence of the antiquity of the Creed is furnished by an interesting notice in the preface to the Oratorian Commentary, which tells us that the Quicunque was ascribed to S. Athanasius, *etiam in veteribus codicibus*, from which it appears that even in the earlier part of the eighth century 'old manuscripts' not only contained the Creed, but actually gave it as the work of the saint whose name still clings to it: a convincing proof, one would think, that the Creed was no recent composition at the time when this Commentary was first drawn up.

We have not space to follow Mr. Ommanney's arguments further, but there is much more that is interesting and important, and tends to establish the old view so rudely disturbed some years back, that the Creed is a genuine work of the fifth century, and comes from the pen of some Gallican Divine well versed in the works of S. Augustine, the actual author being very possibly (as was suggested long ago by Antelmi) S. Vincent of Lerins, the author of the *Commonitorium*. Mr. Ommanney's book deserves, and doubtless will receive, a thorough and searching examination at the hands of competent critics. It is certainly not only the ablest vindication of the early date of the Creed that has appeared during the present controversy, but also the most damaging exposé of the weakness of Dr. Swainson's theory, the shifts to which he is put in order to support it, the overwhelming weight of evidence which he is compelled in its interests to ignore, and the painful and inexplicable inaccuracies with which his writings teem; and we shall be curious to see whether any reply is forthcoming.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools. General Editor, J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, with Maps, Notes, and Introduction. By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., Canon of Westminster. (For the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge and London, 1880.)

THOSE of us who have found Canon Farrar's style in his sermons and descriptive writings too luscious for our taste, and those who have felt at times rather weary of his epithets, may be agreeably surprised to find in this comparatively small volume that he can accommodate his pen to the proper limits of a critical commentary.

And in this sphere he is peculiarly qualified to do useful service. He knows by experience what sort of notes boys will use, and his linguistic and grammatical studies on the one hand, and his wide reading on the other, ensure that his work shall not lack either illustration or interest. The first note in the book is on the etymology of the word *gospel*, the last excursus (No. vii.) is composed of 'Illustrations of St. Luke derived from the *Talmud*,' a source of study from which the editor had already drawn in his larger work. Moreover, it is advantageous that a writer of undoubted popularity, like Dr. Farrar, should employ his powers in bringing some of the results of

Digitized by Google

Dr. Westcott's deeper studies to the notice of a class which they might otherwise fail to reach. Nor has he neglected writers whom most of our readers will delight to see quoted. On one leaf (for instance) the authors mentioned are Bengel, J. H. Blunt (*Annotated Prayer-Book*), Bishop Wordsworth, and Pearson *on the Creed.*

There are two points in which we fear that much modern school-teaching on religious subjects is defective: (1) *The didactic inculcation of Christian duty* (though no doubt Public School Sermons have done much to teach boys to connect life with doctrine, since such sermons were commenced at Winchester and Rugby almost simultaneously). Considering the character of the two novels of student life which are attributed to Dr. Farrar, we are rather surprised not to find this element more appreciable in his notes on *S. Luke.* One on viii. 12 (behaviour after service) is the only instance we have noticed. (2) *The definite enunciation of the fundamental doctrines* of the Christian Faith. In this respect we believe that so far as this little volume goes the editor has been more faithful to his duty than too many other teachers, spiritual pastors, and masters. He teaches the Divinity of our Lord (pp. 68, 145, 170, 311) by implication, and more clearly (p. 75) where he states the conclusions of the four Councils; also the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity (p. 93). We note with pleasure such sayings as 'We cannot but wonder at the vast faith of the despised and persecuted Virgin of Nazareth, whose inspired anticipations have been so amply fulfilled (i. 48) . . . Notice in this hymn more than one anticipation of the Beatitudes.' '*First-born* . . . does not necessarily imply that the Virgin had other children.' (We are thankful that on p. 168 also the editor has abstained from asserting the Helvidian theory put forward in the *Life of Christ.*) Here is another dogmatic sentence: 'God is His Father in a different way from that in which He is ours. He is our Father only because He is *His* Father' (ii. 49; *S. John* xx. 17). The view of 'eternal hope' is very moderately advanced (pp. 255, 269, 270).

We find, as might be expected, a good many valuable pithy notes, *e.g.* 'St. Luke must be ranked as the *first Christian hymnologist.*' 'Her curvature is directly attributed to Satanic agency' (xiii. 11). 'The *vox populi* was in this instance *vox Diaboli*' (xxiii. 21).

'The modern "Altruism" and *vivre pour autrui*, though pompously enunciated as the bases of a new religion, are but a mutilated reproduction of this' (vi. 31). (This, by the way, we think, has been expressed in better language by Dr. Mozley, whose sermons, however, we are glad to see mentioned definitely by Canon Farrar elsewhere.)

Some questions of Theology—the impeccability of Christ, the emission of the uncreated light at the Transfiguration (which yet he clearly distinguishes from solar or created light), pp. 96, 189—he dismisses as rash and irreverent. On the Words of Institution (xxii. 19) we think an extract from some devout writer (such as Ken's, 'the manner of it we cannot understand') would be more wholesome for boys than the most moderate of rebukes to 'Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, &c.'

Though the statement that 'such expressions as *Theotokos*, and

Digitized by Google

"Mother of God," are unknown to Scripture' is literally true, we should have preferred to see the title fairly and historically dealt with—*or* let alone. (He makes no exception against *Theodokos* and *Theophoros* when applied to *men*, p. 72.) And for our part we do not see that *gratiâ plena* is incompatible with *gratiâ cumulata* (p. 51), so far as words go. Again, we doubt if there is greater difficulty in believing the absolute fast of forty days than other mysteries of the Incarnation (*e.g.* Christ's absolute sinlessness, or the absolute continuity of the Body which was buried in the grave-clothes with the Body of His resurrection). And we cannot honestly think that 'St. Luke's phrase . . . *He did eat nothing* . . . probably implies no more than . . . that He fasted.' The longer of two notes upon *S. Luke* v. 35 (on the duty of fasting) is fairly expressed, excepting that the first and last sentences, taken together, seem to lead us to the conclusion that the Church at Antioch thought (*Acts* xiii. 2, 3) that the Bridegroom was taken from them, but that Dr. Farrar does not think so *now*. He has omitted to remind the sons of the Church of England, for whom we gather that he writes, that she has a Table of Days of Fasting or Abstinence. We cannot complain of Dr. Farrar for making free use of his private judgment in selecting from the patristic expositions which, if non-natural, may be no less spiritual. Yet we are not sure that the 'mere artificial "afterthoughts of theology,"' may not have been also forethoughts of the Word of God (see pp. 377, 260). The editor adopts many comments of the Fathers without misgiving; some (*e.g.* the connexion of the Evangelists, and their representations of our Lord, with the Four Living Creatures) he treats lovingly, as Sir T. Browne does his *Vulgar Errors*, or Piscator his frog; others he treats with ridicule. It would have been well to have simply passed by those which he could not commend. To some minds the most outrageous of the mystical interpretations which he thinks it worth while to condemn, will not seem more fanciful than some which the editor seems to be willing to adopt (*e.g.* from S. Augustine that the mention of a well (xiv. 5) '*may* be an allusion to the . . . *watery* disease).'

The Introduction, Indexes (general and philological) and Maps (environs of Jerusalem, Palestine, Galilee, and Sea of Galilee) are serviceable.

Our readers may like to know Dr. Farrar's opinion on some disputed points: The eagles and the body cannot refer to Christ and the Faithful; Zacharias was not High Priest; the parable of the bottles referred to wine which was not kept for fermentation (Excursus iii.); the Last Supper was not strictly a Jewish Passover; the Transfiguration took place at night on Mount Hermon. He is inclined to agree with 'the Christian Church in identifying this woman (vii. 37) with Mary Magdalene.' He pronounces against the *illative* sense of ὅτι in vii. 47, and despairs of 'the second sabbath after the first.' S. Luke's order is mainly chronological, though not in the narrative of the Temptation. Ch. xii. 5 does not refer to Satan.

We are most thankful to find protests (now, alas! necessary even for boys) against 'the unworthy theory of some German theologians'

Digitized by Google

(which would suppose opposition between S. Luke and S. Peter), p. 187, and against other sceptical assertions or suggestions (pp. 63, 118, 350, 351, cf. 357), and against the shocking notion of hallucination (pp. 361, 365) which haunted poor Clough, and which we fear has been suggested to many minds by the insidious romance of *Philochristus.*

The Student's Commentary on the Holy Bible. Founded on the *Speaker's Commentary.* Abridged and Edited by J. M. FULLER, M.A. Vol. III., containing Books from Job to the Song of Solomon. (London: John Murray, 1880.)

MR. FULLER continues his useful task of providing a comparatively brief and portable Commentary on the meaning of the Old Testament, such as the young student may find not too bewildering to his untrained powers, or too heavy for his purse. The volume before us is in several respects of special difficulty for this mode of treatment. The Book of Job contains the most daring speculations of the thinkers of the ancient world upon

> 'Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
> Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute.'

A similar remark may be made with regard to the Book of Coheleth, or, as our version entitles it, Ecclesiastes; while the Song of Solomon requires especially able and delicate treatment, if it be desired to lead the thoughts of young students to the depths of spiritual experience. The Psalms again present a vast subject for the commentator; and it demands the nicest skill to avoid the opposite extremes of inadequacy and verboseness. The present Editor has apparently performed his task with conscientious care; and, as the work proceeds, we are more and more convinced that those clergy who are in want of such a work as we have described, for the benefit of young readers of any class, may safely put it into their hands. We should not omit to give a word of well-deserved appreciation to the Notes and Comments upon the Song of Solomon. In them a very difficult task has been performed with an acuteness of spiritual insight, and a beauty and delicacy of handling which is truly admirable.

The Old Testament with a Brief Commentary by Various Authors. (Prophetical Books.) (London: S.P.C.K., 1880.)

Another Commentary, of more modest pretension, and of purposely simple treatment, but quite as useful in its way as that noticed above, is that issued by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, of which a new volume has just appeared, containing the *Prophetical Books, Isaiah to Malachi.* The Dean of Canterbury has annotated the Prophecy of Isaiah; and the brief, simple, but edifying Commentary on Daniel is from the pen of the late Prebendary Bullock, Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Dr. Kay's exposition of Ezekiel is admirable upon the whole. His notes upon the Prophetic Vision in chapter 1 of the Four Living Creatures, are remarkably clear as well as profound, and will no doubt

Digitized by Google

convey to many inquirers for the first time a distinct idea of what was intended by the Vision. At the same time, we note a certain deficiency in the mystical interpretation which this prophecy particularly needs. For example, the exposition of xliv. 2, 3, 'this gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened,' κ.τ.λ., consists of general and pointless platitudes, and there is not a hint of that consensus of expositors, including S. Augustine, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Jerome, S. Ambrose, S. Bernard, by which it has been unhesitatingly referred to the Incarnation of Our Lord of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Again, on xl. 31, with reference to the eight steps of the sanctuary, we should very much like to know Dr. Kay's reasons for his *dictum* that 'eight is the signature of the New Covenant, as seven of the Old.' And, at all events, seven appears to be used quite as freely as characteristic of the New Temple or New Jerusalem, whichever it be interpreted, as is eight. It is no doubt perfectly true that chapters xl.–xlviii. are 'clearly and continuously allegorical;' but it would have been well to give somewhat more fully and plainly a key to the allegory. We do not make these observations in a spirit of fault-finding; but because we think the treatise really good and valuable, and we wish that it might be strengthened in the respects indicated.

It is a great benefit that the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge have bestowed on the Church at large in providing Churchmen with a series of expositions of the Sacred Scriptures so edifying, so plain and clear, and, above all, so portable and *cheap*.

The First Epistle of S. John. A Contribution to Biblical Theology. By ERICH HAUPT. Translated, with an Introduction, by W. B. POPE, D.D., Didsbury College, Manchester. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1880.)

THIS commentary—the single contribution of its author to theological literature—is of a somewhat unusual kind; it is the laborious evolution and expression of the *ideas* which the writer conceives to underlie this Epistle. He distinguishes (and here, no doubt, he is right) between labours 'of a critical, philological, polemic, and historical kind' and the proper task of *exposition*, viz. the 'intellectually reproducing the document in question;' and he complains, with a good deal of truth, that these merely *preliminary* inquiries have attained such dimensions that they seriously hinder the attainment of the main object of *exposition*, that 'the mind of the reader is drawn in so many directions, and occupied with so many and separate questions, that the one single impression of the book itself is lost.'

He has, therefore, omitted all these from his commentary, and confined himself to the *ideas* underlying the Epistle. He argues, with a good deal of force, that this Epistle, so far from being what some have called it, 'an unmethodized effusion of pious sentiments and reflections, which betrays all the marks of senility,' is, on the contrary, 'the closing doctrinal testimony of the last and greatest teacher of the Christian Church, the *only doctrinal work* in which S. John speaks in his own person, and complementary to the Epistles of S. Paul and S. Peter, all or most of which he had before him.'

Digitized by Google

So considerable a claim requires and receives a powerful argument in its defence. It is admirable in many respects, but far too long and diffuse. An analysis of not more than seventy or eighty pages in length, embodying all the chief points of the argument, would be of very great general use. It will have occurred to our readers how this thorough and painstaking examination of the intention of the sacred writer furnishes the best of all antidotes to that jejune and superficial method of exposition on which, as bearing indeed on this very Epistle, we commented in a recent number (*Ch. Qu. Rev.*, pp. 339–343). For example, in dealing with the φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων of v. 21, Professor Haupt is far from going out of his way to deal a blow at an unpopular belief by referring the εἴδωλα to the extravagances of a later age. He does not take the word, as we should ourselves have preferred, of the actually present *idols* which surrounded the Apostle at Antioch. But his exegesis is at once thoughtful and certainly at least tenable. The 'εἴδωλα are the ideas entertained of God by the false prophets of whom the Apostle has spoken, the Antichrists, who, because they have not the Son, have not the Father also, without being therefore atheists, κ.τ.λ.' We do not quite see how an *idea* can be an *idol*, though the idol may be sometimes the embodiment of the idea.

Similarly there is to be found in our author no support of that mere cavil which asserts that in the Epistle no allusion is made to the sacraments. He says, indeed, plainly enough, what is as plain on the surface of the Epistle, that Baptism and the Eucharist are not mentioned *eo nomine;* but he is just as decided in affirming that they are mystically and symbolically referred to (pp. 302, 303). And this is, in fact, the characteristic manner of S. John whenever he is referring to sacraments or the sacramental idea: of which instances from the Gospel will easily occur—e.g. chap. iii. *passim*, iv. 14, and especially the great discourses in chapters vi. and vii.

We might carry much further this detailed examination of Haupt's conclusions. It may be, however, enough to say that the Catholic-minded student will generally find help in so doing from the pages of the work before us. We do not at all mean that he will always agree with this commentator—far from it: but he will get the results of much patient and laborious thought, undertaken with an honest purpose of elucidating the sense of the sacred writer. It will be found that not seldom he coincides with the great lines of traditional exposition, or at least is consistent with them; and that this is no small thing to say, those whose pursuits lead them to peruse the narrow pedantry and shallow sciolism of sundry popular commentaries are sadly aware.

Outlines of the History of Religion to the Spread of the Universal Religions. By C. P. TIELE, Dr. Theol., Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Leiden. Translated from the Dutch by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A. (London: Trübner and Co., 1877.)

author of this volume intends by the phrase 'the universal ons' to denote the three great faiths which divide the mass of

Digitized by Google

humanity among them, viz. Islam, Buddhism, and Christianity: apparently because these alone have shown a capacity to grow and spread themselves beyond a single race or group of races. The fundamental principle with which he starts is that all changes in religions are the results of natural growth. 'Religion in its most general sense,' he sets out by asserting, 'is a universal phenomenon of humanity.' Accordingly we are to see religion starting sporadically from a number of independent centres—self-sown, as it were—and these separate species of religion coalesced from age to age, as they grew, until they merged into the three great types to which we have already adverted. Another, and apparently cross division, is into *polytheistic* religions, including most of the Indo-Germanic and Semitic religions, and the Egyptian; *nomistic*, comprising Confucianism, Jovism, Mosaism, and Judaism, Brahmanism and Mazdeism, and thirdly, *universal*. The earliest form of religion traceable in any portion of the human race, according to him, is *Animism*, the belief in the existence of souls or spirits, and reverence paid to them. This is not, he thinks, 'itself a religion, but a sort of primitive philosophy, which not only controls religion, but rules the whole life of the natural man.' The powerful among the spirits, upon whom man conceives himself as dependent, acquire the rank of divine beings, become objects of worship, and so a polytheistic form of religion is generated, which grows, culminates, and declines, and then merges into some purer faith. Whether this be a correct description of the process of thought in many nations of the ancient world, from the point to which the records carry us back, which is already far down the stream of time, and far removed from their origin—an important limitation, which Dr. Tiele omits to make—we do not now inquire. It is manifest that as a general hypothesis, covering all the phenomena, and treating religion, wherever it is found, as a strictly natural phenomenon, it can take its place only on the ruins of revelation; a result which we, at all events, may be permitted to regard as a *reductio ad absurdum*, sufficient to deprive it of any authoritative value, if indeed it could ever have been thought to possess any. The book traces a vast subject with the merest outline: generally the author's purpose appears to have been to jot down his conclusions merely, without supplying also the facts upon which they are founded—a thing absolutely necessary in an inquiry of this kind. It would have no doubt required volumes to treat satisfactorily so vast a subject, while Dr. Tiele himself calls his work 'outlines, pencil sketches, I might say, nothing more;' and it does not seem to us that he has carried out quite uniformly his own ground plan. But the work is a valuable summary of facts and results, if we use it for that purpose, and put its theories on one side altogether.

Steps through the Stream; or, Daily Readings for a Month. By MARGARET STEWART SIMPSON. (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1879.)

'THESE are days,' said a learned Professor in our hearing, 'when one almost shakes hand with a Deist.' Certainly it cannot be denied that the spread of unbelief (even if its progress be sometimes exaggerated)

Digitized by Google

does tend to make us more conscious of the bond of union caused by any agreement in belief. And if even Deism can suggest some faint hopes of possible concord, much more can we cherish sympathies where there is a common acceptance of the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. The little book before us, though not very much larger than some pamphlets of our time, seems to have struck a responsive chord in many hearts, having in a short time reached a second edition. This success is, we presume, in great measure due to the evident sincerity of the writer, and to the fact (admitted in the introduction from the pen of a friend) that it is the result of a sorrow. The maxim,

'Haud ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco,'

is true; even more fully true in Christian times than it could have been in the days of Virgil. Beyond this, we suppose that many persons are predisposed to like a book which assumes throughout certain leading tenets, such as, for example, the following: That even Christians need conversion of heart; that the conversion is often sudden; that its date can generally be known; that the converted should immediately try to influence others in the same direction; that the doctrine of assurance is true. It seems worth while to glance for a moment at these positions in detail.

That many Christians, even amongst those who are not living in wilful defiance of God's law, do still need conversion of heart, is a proposition accepted, we presume, among Christians everywhere. Here even Roman Catholic writers would be found to agree with the author of this little book, who is, we understand, a Presbyterian. Thus we find Alban Butler writing of Loyola, that he converted many abandoned sinners, and occasionally speaking also of the conversion of bishops and others who were not leading lives outwardly indecorous. And, again, we see Cardinal Newman, amidst all his changes, adhering on this point to his earliest convictions, and describing (to cite his own words) 'the inward conversion of which I was conscious, and of which I am more certain than that I have hands and feet.' All that we demur to on this head is the teaching that *sensible* conversion must necessarily be a part of *every* Christian's inward life.

Further, it is not disputed that such conversion may often be, to all appearance, very sudden, and all but instantaneous. We say to all appearance, because it is quite conceivable that a crisis may have been, *Deo favente*, brought about by a train of preparations, of which the person himself is hardly conscious. But on the main point there is evidence from very different quarters. The seemingly trivial circumstance which summoned the late Lord Aberdeen (better known as Lord Haddo) to a devoted life differs so slightly from that which hurried away from the *beau-monde* to a brotherhood the great French preacher, Xavier de Ravignan, that the incidents might be transferred from one biography to the other without any one suspecting the exchange. And it must be reckoned among the mysteries of our nature that alteration of views in the opposite direction has been known to be equally sudden. The unhappy Leopardi declares that

Digitized by Google

his adoption of Atheism arose out of the sudden conviction of a moment.

Then, again, that those who have undergone a vital change should seek to be instruments of a similar change in others must be recognized as a dictate of conscience, which is sanctioned and confirmed by Holy Scripture. 'Then will I teach transgressors thy ways,' is an utterance occurring in the most penitential psalm. 'When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren,' is the language of our Lord to the Apostle who was about to deny Him. But it is surely a task which should be conjoined on the part of penitents with a keen abiding sense of humiliation, and which in many cases should not be entered upon immediately. To say thus much is not suggesting more than we actually find in the case of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. To the last he owns himself 'an abortive birth,' one 'not meet to be called an Apostle;' and before commencing his new work, he retired for a long time into Arabia, where, says Bishop Ellicott, 'his primary object . . . seems to have been meditation and seclusion.' We fear that there have been cases in which penitents, who have too hastily assumed the office of teachers, have been known to experience the most saddening relapses. Perhaps such falls might have been spared them, if they had imitated the patient waiting and prior self-discipline of which S. Paul is so eminent an example.

Lastly, despite all our sympathy with religious earnestness, we find ourselves unable to accept the tenet of assurance which seems to be implied in the pages before us. It is of course most true that at a certain point of their career the certainty of their perseverance was revealed to Daniel, to the eleven Apostles and to S. Paul; and we cannot presume to say that what was granted to them may not in the Divine wisdom be vouchsafed to eminent servants of God who have lived at an earlier or a later period of the world's history. But to suppose the consciousness of such a revelation to be the normal condition of ordinarily good Christians is, to our thinking, anti-scriptural. The passages cited in favour of such a belief all seem to us either to refer to communities (such as Philippians i. 6, 7), or to leave out the important word *sin*, an omission specially noted by Chillingworth in Romans viii. 38, 39. But the passages which speak of the possibility of really good persons falling away are clear and unmistakable. There is, for example, the case of Solomon. It will be said that he repented. One may hope so, and Jewish tradition favours the idea. But of direct evidence from Holy Scripture there is no atom of proof. To say nothing of Saul, what evidence have we for the insincerity of Demas, or even of Judas, at the outset of their acceptance of Christ's law? Then, again, how completely is the possibility of falling away recognized in the Book of Ezekiel (xviii. 24), in the Epistles of S. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 27), and in the discourses of our Lord Himself (S. Matt. xii. 43–45; S. Luke xi. 24–26). Neither can we doubt but that Hebrews x. 38, if rightly construed (which it unfortunately is not in the A.V.), naturally points to the same conclusion.

We have felt compelled, as a matter of honesty, to dwell upon

Digitized by Google

these points of difference. Yet we can well believe that numbers of those who are attracted by such works as that before us do, in fact, dwell in heart and recollection, not on topics of controversy, but on those on which there may happily be still said to be a creed of Christendom. And simple expositions and suggestions may find their way where more elaborate ones fail to penetrate.

The Daily Round. Meditation, Prayer, and Praise; adapted to the course of the Christian Year. (London : J. Whitaker, 1880.)

We will let the author speak for himself as to the object and plan of his little book :—

'The aim of *The Daily Round* is to help, day by day, in few, plain words, those who wish to know God's truth, to gain God's grace, and to do God's will. The course of the Church's year and the order of the Church's services are followed. Thus the deep things of God, the mysterious workings of grace, and the laws that claim to rule man's life are dealt with as they come. Each page has five parts. 1. Some words of Holy Scripture. 2. A short statement of what those words mean and teach. 3. Some thoughts and reflections intended to bring home the general lesson, so as to make it of personal practical use. 4. A prayer in which what has been brought before mind and heart is laid before God. 5. A verse of a hymn.'

The idea is excellent, and it has been most successfully carried out. We think that it will supply a want which we have long felt of something on the lines of Bogatsky's *Golden Treasury*, but with more definite Church teaching. The style is terse and pithy; every word tells; the quantity of matter compressed within the limits of a page is quite astonishing. The tone of the meditations and prayers is simple, earnest, and devout, with nothing morbid or overstrained. We heartily recommend the book, as one calculated to foster a spirit of sound practical Church of England piety, while there is nothing to wound the susceptibilities of any school of Churchmen; and we trust that it may have a circulation as wide as that of the work to which it owes its title.

Life and Work among the Navvies. By D. W. Barrett, M.A., Vicar of Nassington; late Curate in charge of the Bishop of Peterborough's Railway Mission. (London : W. Wells Gardner, 1880.)

We have here an account (1) of the progress and statistics of part of the Midland Railway direct route from London to Nottingham, commenced in June 1875, and opened for passenger traffic on March 1, 1880; (2) of the life and habits of miners, navvies, 'brickies,' and others engaged on railway works; (3) of the progress of a Mission, with its three hut-chapels and schools, which was organized by the Bishop of Peterborough, with the co-operation of the clergy and landowners of Rutland, as well as of the contractors (Messrs. Lucas and Aird) and their representatives, and carried on mainly by the author (as mission-priest or chaplain), who had been previously a curate, and is now an incumbent, in the same diocese.

While the first part has the transient interest for the general reader

Digitized by Google

which unfamiliar matters not unfrequently possess, the second section has its intrinsic value in the suggestions which are given for the improvement of the social and moral condition of the men, which to some extent lies in their own hands, as well as in those of the contractors, some of whom (notably Mr. T. A. Walker, and Messrs. Lucas and Aird) have shown that they have at heart the welfare of their 'people.' The establishment of a workman's 'shelter' and reading-room, and of a coffee-stall, in charge of some sensible and popular manager; arranging the attendance of a Post Office savings' bank officer on pay-days; the erection of a small hospital; and the provision of wooden (not turf) huts for lodgers, instead of billeting on villagers, &c.; and the opening of a 'shanty' (or monster lodging-house) as a venture on the part of the contractors themselves, and under their own control; these are the most important recommendations. The shanties, as they are at present constituted (though in some respects they are appreciated by 'navvies'), are apt to be ill-conducted dens; and the magistrates and landowners of Rutland are to be congratulated in having outwitted the plausible proposals of one harpy, who had a mind to establish a 'tommy-shop' in the thick of Mr. Barrett's district.

A chapter is devoted to the peculiar nicknames common on the works. Our fancy is especially taken by '*Concertina Cockney*.' It may interest us to guess at the steps by which the ancient city *Gezer* has come to lend its name to an old-fashioned boy, or King *Solomon* to surrender *his* to a job or 'works' in general. The 'bricky' language is in itself mainly that 'rhyming slang,' which, according to Mr. Camden Hotten's Dictionary (appendix), was introduced about 1845. In this strange dialect, 'on the frog and toad,' means 'on the road,' 'round the houses' = trouse's, 'bark and growl' = a trow'l, and so forth. We wonder whether these phrases occur as rhymes to their ordinary equivalents at the end of distichs in the products of the Catnach press or other Seven Dials' literature.

The third section, some eighty pages, or about half the book, contains an account of the mission work. Though some of its interest is due to its experimental character, it will be the text-book for chaplains (who it is to be hoped will be attached to future works), especially the short chapter on Leisure Evenings. Under *Red-letter Days* Mr. Barrett classes such occasions as visits from the Bishops of Peterborough and Lincoln, a remarkable service in the Glaston Tunnel, and the Confirmation in the hut-chapel. The navvy population was fluctuating; nevertheless some of them were communicants at the chapel and parish churches.

We should be tempted to carp at the style in which some passages are written, but the author has disarmed criticism by stating that he has adapted it to be read by those among whom he worked so lately. We must suppose that he knows best what suits them. On p. 73, 'the worse of drink' looks like a slip. It is a pity that he should give way to the error (not uncommon in ladies' compositions) of using inverted commas where there is no quotation. We notice at random 'brickbats,' 'alias,' and 'too numerous to mention.' The

Digitized by Google

author will not accuse us of having ourselves fallen into the same pit, for he will know that 'our people' is a household word with Lucas and Aird's men. The book is suitably bound, and will be both popular and useful.

La Métaphysique et ses Rapports avec les autres Sciences. Par TH. DESDOUITS. 12mo. (Paris: Thorin.)

M. DESDOUITS, author of an excellent work on the philosophy of Kant, has just published a small essay which, we are glad to hear, obtained one of the highest rewards bestowed by the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques. The subject proposed to the candidates was whether metaphysics can legitimately be called a science on the same grounds as mathematics, physics, and the other branches of knowledge exclusively patronized by the positivists of our age. We see at once that the French Académie was thus, on the one hand, endeavouring to lead the way towards a reaction in favour of moral philosophy, and, on the other, throwing down a challenge to the adepts of materialism. Whether any answer will be made to M. Desdouits is more than we can say, but, at any rate, his *brochure* deserves the deepest attention from all thinkers, whether they are disposed or not to endorse the views he so ably puts forth.

The fact that he stands out as the champion of metaphysics is bold enough at an epoch when nothing but the *phenomenal* is deemed worthy of study; but M. Desdouits goes further still. In his chapter entitled *Du Progrès en Métaphysique*, and in the note which supplements it, he says plainly that the reconciliation of metaphysics with Christianity is the only true goal at which we should aim, and that the effort made to dissociate philosophy from Christianity must really be regarded as the reason why the study of the invisible is just now so unfashionable. What will M. Cousin's few remaining disciples answer to this statement?

The great quality of the memoir we are now noticing is its clearness, and the perspicuous method in which all its arguments are arranged and deduced from one another. M. Desdouits begins by defining science in general; he examines its nature, its conditions, and he shows that the definition he arrives at applies exactly to metaphysics. One of the great objections raised against the thesis so ably defended by M. Desdouits is that there can be no science where there is no certainty, and that the distinguishing characteristics of metaphysical investigation are precisely their hypothetical nature. The fallacy of such a criticism is, we believe, excellently demonstrated, and our author proves that the *à priori* certainty of metaphysical truth is indirectly verified by experimental science itself.

The claims of metaphysics to be called a science being duly made out, M. Desdouits goes on, in the second part of his *brochure*, to refute the objections raised both by empiricism (school of Messrs. Mill, Spencer, Auguste Comte, &c.) and by transcendental scepticism (schools of Kant and Hegel). Not only, he asserts, are the notions of *cause*, of *substance*, of the *absolute* and the *infinite*, the fundamental laws of thought and the very condition of *all* the sciences, but they

Digitized by Google

have an objective reality, and the fact that we cannot solve this problem, the most difficult of all, arises from the circumstance that it can be stated only in words, instead of being *sensibly* illustrated.

It remains to be examined, in conclusion, why the progress of metaphysical science has been checked, and why, on a question so vital, an almost endless number of answers have been propounded, identified with schools so diverse that an exhaustive classification of them is all but impossible. In the first place, we notice with M. Desdouits that no demonstration, however irrefutable it may be, will convince those who have *à priori* determined to reject the existence of God and the possibility of arriving at truth. The mania for abstraction is another cause which deserves to be well considered; materialists, pantheists, and sceptics, after separating by a mental process the phenomenon from the substance, the effect from its cause, the quality from the concrete being which is its subject, &c., people with these abstractions an imaginary world, and allow themselves to be deceived and to deceive others through a mere trick of language. Hence practical consequences which are of the most serious kind, because they affect both the destinies of society and the conduct of the individual man. 'The name of free-thinker,' says M. Desdouits, 'is often usurped by the atheist and the fatalist, as if one was more free when he makes use of his liberty for the purpose of doubting than when he employs it in the service of belief and adoration.' Our author concludes by showing that the multiplicity of philosophical systems tend to diminish, and that the final struggle will take place between spiritualism and the adversaries of all metaphysical truth. But even our adversaries have been obliged to abandon certain positions they formerly occupied, and to acknowledge, for instance, that all things are ordered *as if an intellect of some kind had presided over the creation of the universe.* The conflict may be a long one, but its ultimate issue will be the rehabilitation of spiritualism.

La Bible au Seizième Siècle: Etude sur les Origines de la Critique Biblique. Par SAMUEL BERGER. 8vo. (Paris: Fischbacher.)

M. SAMUEL BERGER, under-librarian at the French Institute, has recently published a work of considerable value on the origin of Biblical exegesis. As the title naturally suggests, the period of which he treats is the sixteenth century; but, in order to discuss the subject thoroughly, he was obliged to describe what was the critical knowledge of the Word of God during the Middle Ages, and to determine, if possible, how the labours of Erasmus, Luther, and Melanchthon were prepared, and either facilitated or hindered, by the theologians and *savants* who came before them. M. Berger observes that the history of mediæval exegesis still remains to be written. The oratorian Richard Simon, Rosenmüller, Mess. Reuss, Leopold Delisle, and quite recently the Abbé Trochon (*Essai sur l'Histoire de la Bible dans la France Chrétienne au Moyen Age*), have indeed marked out, if we may so say, the outlines of the subject, but not more; and it is much to be wished that a man of learning, of piety, and of

Digitized by Google

independent judgment would devote himself to the task; and, for the sake of studying thoroughly an important branch of Biblical literature, would make up his mind to set at defiance the dulness of the scholastic theologians. In the meanwhile M. Berger has very neatly and accurately given a sketch which others might profitably fill up and supplement. He introduces us, not to the great mediæval commentators and exegetes, but to men of inferior note and of humble position; to quote his words, 'he desires to tell his readers what were the ideas respecting the Holy Scriptures which prevailed during the closing centuries of the Middle Ages amongst the lower clergy and the mendicant orders—that is to say, in the ranks of those who in the Church distinctly represented the popular element.' This part of the volume forms three distinct chapters. Our author begins by giving us curious details on the money value of MS. copies of the Bible, the way in which they were circulated, and the character of the works of edification which were often studied together with, or instead of, the Scriptures. We are thus led to an enquiry into the exegetical resources placed at the disposal of scholars, such as the glosses of Walafridus Strabo, the treatise of Hugo de Sancto Charo, and the postils of the celebrated Franciscan Nicolas de Lyra. Gulielmus Brito, *homo furibundus et impatiens*, as one of his contemporaries calls him, is not forgotten; and M. Berger tells us all about the glosses or Biblical dictionaries which, being the works of successive compilers, were more and more imperfect in course of time, because each commentator, making free use of the labours of his predecessors, added to them his own inaccuracy and want of judgment. The third chapter, devoted to the interpretation of the Scriptures, shows how widely different from one another were the views entertained on the subject by divines holding high positions in the Church, and how uncertain a guide to the doubtful was even Gratian's celebrated *Concordia Discordantium Canonum*. The authority of the Bible had become so uncertain towards the close of the fifteenth century, says M. Berger, and its interpretation so arbitrary, that one of the most distinguished German pulpit orators, Geiler von Kaysersberg, was justified in exclaiming, '*Die heilige geschrifft ist wie ein wechseni nas; man bügt es war man wil.*'

We have thus stated, as briefly as possible, the scope of M. Berger's first part; in the second he gives us an account of the revolution accomplished throughout the Continent by Erasmus, Luther, Carlstadt, Calvin, Zwingli, Theodore Beza, and the Stephens in the various branches of exegetical science. In opposition to the principle of interpretation which had obtained during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance doctors laid it down as an axiom that the Bible has only one meaning, and that it should be interpreted in accordance with the ordinary grammatical rules and the simple, obvious sense of the words. Erasmus endeavoured to explain this view, but the difficulties arising from the multiplicity of readings in the Greek Testament immediately stood up before his path, and thus the science of exegesis was born. The Rotterdam doctor had neither the calmness nor the firmness of character which should characterize the true critic, but he

Digitized by Google

represented intellectual freedom and scientific honesty at an epoch when modern scholarship was still *in incunabulis.*

Time will not allow us to follow M. Berger in all his interesting appreciations of the Reformation movement; let us note, however, the distinction he draws between the theological views of the German Lutherans, who considered the Scriptures as the *rule of faith*, and those of the French Calvinists, who rather looked upon them as the *source* of the doctrine held by the Church. It is curious also to see the revolutionary Carlstadt more conservative than Luther so far as the respect due to the canon of Scripture is concerned; for whereas Luther unhesitatingly declared that the character and constituent parts of God's Holy Word must be subservient to certain theological doctrines, his adversary, on the other hand, maintained that the canon is an historical fact, and that the canonical character of this or that book depends not on the doctrine it teaches, but on the general *consensus* which has given it a place in the Holy Scriptures. In conclusion, we cordially recommend M. Berger's volume to the notice of our readers.

The Hibbert Lectures, 1879. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt. Delivered in May and June, 1879. By P. Le Page Renouf. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1880.)

The subject of the *Hibbert Lectures* for 1879 presents many points of difference from that which Professor Max Müller handled in 1878, yet its interest is certainly not less. Mr. Renouf had not to draw his materials from a collection of writings still held sacred by millions of men, and consequently he could furnish no parallel to his predecessor's 'walking manuscripts.'[1] The Vedic hymns had too a special interest for us as the oldest extant Aryan literature, an interest culminating in the identification of *Dyaush-pitâ*, Ζεὺς πατήρ, Jupiter, and the Teutonic Tiu, whose name we still pronounce in Tuesday. As to the ancient Egyptians and their language, the questions are not yet absolutely decided what is the ethnological position of the former, and what the linguistic position of the latter. The Egyptians probably came from the interior of Asia. The Egyptian type, as seen in early portrait statues and paintings, approaches the European the further back we go. In reference to one specimen, Professor Owen said: 'With English costume and complexion, this Egyptian of the Ancient Empire would pass for a well-to-do, sensible British citizen and rate-payer.'[2]

But Mr. Renouf's subject had its own points of interest. In the first place, to say nothing of inscriptions on monuments which were already ancient in the time of Moses, he could adduce the testimony of *manuscripts* now existing, which not only reproduce originals still older than themselves, but are actually 'not less than four thousand

[1] See *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878. By F. Max Müller, M.A. Lect. iii.
[2] Quoted by Mr. Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, p. 54.

Digitized by Google

years old.'[1] And Mr. Renouf vindicates the claim of 'the *Maxims of Ptahhotep*, written in the age of the Pyramids,' and of 'the tales in the Berlin papyri, written more than two thousand years before Christ,' to be 'considered literature as truly as they would be if they were now written in English, French, or Italian.'[2]

While we have in the foreground, then, the most ancient writings and the oldest literature in the world, the background is occupied by historical memorials of the most ancient empire whose history is known—by evidences of art, of civilization, of an elaborate system of government, all three belonging to a past at least as remote from the age of Herodotus as the age of Herodotus is from our own—of a 'great isolated trunk of history, a sort of Nile without affluents, without basin, without adjacent valleys, rolling alone in the middle of a desert.'[3] Mr. Renouf says :—

'It is certain that at least three thousand years before Christ there was in Egypt a powerful and elaborately organized monarchy, enjoying a material civilization in many respects not inferior to that of Europe in the last century. . . . The earliest monuments which have been discovered present to us the very same fully-developed civilization and the same religion as the later monuments. The blocks of the Pyramids bear quarry marks exhibiting the decimal notation, and are dated by the months of the Calendar which was in use down to the latest times.'[4]

Nor does the interest diminish when Mr. Renouf examines in detail the moral and religious ideas of the old Egyptians. Moreover, finding as he does find much that is excellent, much that is true for all time in that vast treasury of ancient thought—the thousands of Egyptian texts—the key of which was furnished by the Rosetta stone, and which has been unlocked and explored, though even yet but partially, by the patient labour of the present century, it is perhaps excusable that the exponent of the Egyptian religion should pose in some measure as its apologist. To us, however, the apologies for the Egyptian zoolatry[5] and for the oblations made to the images of deceased persons,[6] &c., appear the least satisfactory portions of this learned and instructive book. The substance of these apologies is, in fact, only the same as that of the apology for every kind of idolatry. 'It is not the *animal* that we worship,' cries the idolater, when twitted with the absurdities of his religion, 'it is not the material wood or stone image to which our devotions are rendered; it is that invisible Power whose attributes these animals symbolize, or

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, p. 169. [2] *Ibid.* p. 172.

[3] *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 1, 1865: 'Les Antiquités Egyptiennes.' By Ernest Renan.

[4] *Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, p. 81. We have no fear lest accurate knowledge of dates may prove fatal to Christianity; but Mr. Renouf's printer has entertained a different idea, and represents him as saying, 'Whatever claim a religion may have to a Divine authority, that claim cannot be extended to its theology, which is nothing else but a system of reasoning upon two sets of data, namely, those furnished by the religion itself, and those furnished by the science of the day' (p. 53). Theology is, of course, a misprint for chronology.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 1–8. [6] *Ibid.* pp. 147 *seq.*

Digitized by Google

it is those invisible spirits whom these images represent; these are what we really honour.' The Egyptian idea with regard to the image was even grosser, according to Mr. Renouf's own account, than is here implied :—

'It is not to be supposed that so intelligent a people as the Egyptians were ignorant of the absurdity of propitiating the wooden or stone images of their ancestors or of themselves. It is the *living* image which is said to be worshipped, and was supposed to reside in the wood or stone. There is an ancient text in reference to Ptah, the chief divinity of Memphis, ... which distinctly speaks of the gods as being made, through his agency, to enter into their bodies, namely, their images of wood or stone.'[1]

The apotheosis of the kings Mr. Renouf does not attempt to defend. He admits the prevalence of 'the belief that the ruling sovereign of Egypt was the living image and vicegerent of the sun-god,' that 'he was invested with the attributes of divinity and that in the earliest times of which we possess monumental evidence.'[2] The utmost that he can say in palliation is, 'that the kings were frequently represented in the humblest postures of adoration before the gods,'[3] while he is constrained to add, 'they are also represented as worshipping and propitiating their own "genius,"' *i.e.* as he explains elsewhere, their own 'double' or '*wraith*.'[4]

After all, however, Mr. Renouf does not go very far in the way of apology. He is too good an Egyptian scholar to be betrayed into asserting that his clients attained to pure monotheism, much less that the monotheism of the Pentateuch was derived from Egypt. We do not think he need have gone out of his way to pronounce against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch,[5]—a large question, into the discussion of which we shall not now follow him. He does not, indeed, deny all historical truth to the Biblical record. 'There is really no reason,' he says, 'for doubting the accuracy of the statement about Pithom and Rameses. Egyptian history renders it most probable that Moses was a contemporary of the great Rameses.'[6] The date of the Great Pyramid, we remark by the way, he puts at about 1,700 years before the Exodus,[7] an interval exceeding by more than four centuries the time which has elapsed since Augustine landed on our shores.

The most considerable name that can be cited in support of the view that pure monotheism existed in Egypt in very early times is that of the late accomplished Egyptologist, M. E. de Rougé. But his views have not been widely adopted, though M. Renan has declared that monotheism is Egyptian in origin, adding, however, that it is the Semitic monotheism which has subdued the world.[8] Mr.

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 149, 150.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 161.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 165.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 147–152.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 49.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 50.
[7] *Ibid.* loc. cit.
[8] *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 1, 1865, 'Les Antiquités Egyptiennes.' M. Renan says elsewhere: 'Cette grande conquête' (the acquisition of monotheism) 'ne fut pas pour elle' (the Semitic race) 'l'effet de progrès; ce fut une de ses premières aperceptions.'

Digitized by Google

Renouf points out that M. de Rougé's opinion was only an inference as to what preceded the constantly increasing polytheism of Egypt, and that even he 'does not venture to assert that at any time within the historical period the worship of one God was anywhere practised to the exclusion of a plurality of gods.'[1] Nor will our author admit that pure monotheism had even a limited existence as 'an esoteric doctrine known to the scribes and priests alone as distinct from the popular belief.' He declares that 'no evidence has yet been produced in favour of this hypothesis.'[2]

Yet there are many startling passages in Egyptian texts, which taken alone could seem to bear no other construction but that which implies monotheistic doctrine either as an original possession of the people or as the privilege of the *élite*. 'Where shall we find a heathen Greek or Latin saying like that of the papyrus on the staircase of the British Museum, "The Great God, Lord of heaven and earth, who made all things which are"; or, . . . "O my God and Lord, who hast made me, and formed me, give me an eye to see and an ear to hear thy glories"?'[3] But passages like these are constantly accompanied by others completely polytheistic.

The truth is that there was in ancient times but one pure monotheism in the world, that of the Semitic race, or rather of its Hebrew branch. To denote the quasi-monotheism found elsewhere, in India and in classical lands, as well as in Egypt, another term had to be found. Mr. Renouf adopts the term 'Henotheism,' which was explained in Professor Max Müller's Lectures of the previous year. 'Each god is to the mind of the suppliant as good as all the gods. He is felt at the time as a real divinity, as supreme and absolute. . . . . All the rest disappear from the vision, ... and he only who is to fulfil their desires stands in full light before the eyes of the worshippers.'[4]

The really excellent features of Egyptian thought are the ethical precepts and the doctrine of future retribution. 'No one could pass to the blissful dwellings of the dead who had failed at the judgment passed in presence of Osiris.'[5] Where shall we find, except in the Bible, an ancient parallel for the following teaching, which we take from Brugsch Bey's account of the *Maxims of Prince Ptahhotep*?—

'If thou hast become great after being little, and if after poverty thou hast amassed wealth, and art in consequence the foremost in thy city . . . . let not thy heart become proud on account of thy wealth; for it is God who is the author of them for thee. Despise not thy neighbour who is what thou wast; behave to him as to thine equal.'[6]

There is a widespread misconception as to the Egyptian character,

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 92. [2] *Ibid.* p. 217.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 216. See also the *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1880, pp. 355 and 368.
[4] *Hibbert Lectures*, 1880, p. 218. [5] *Ibid.* p. 194.
[6] *Histoire d'Égypte*, Première Partie, 2ième éd., 1875, p. 66. Brugsch Bey speaks of the papyrus containing these maxims as 'probably the most ancient manuscript in the world,' and of their author as a prince of the Fifth Dynasty.

Digitized by Google

that it was of a gloomy and morose nature. The very contrary is the fact. It was only too much given to gaiety and conviviality. Even our national vice, as it is called, seems to have prevailed in early Egypt. 'Great quantities of wine, both native and foreign, were consumed; and beer-houses, if we may judge of (? by) the frequency with which they are inveighed against in the papyri, must have been as serious a pest in the time of the great Rameses as they are in the England of the nineteenth century.'[1] Even the *memento mori* presented at banquets, 'the representation of a dead body in a coffin,' with which the English public have been familiarized by Mr. Edwin Long's painting, was intended to stimulate, instead of checking the festivity.[2] The real meaning of it was, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'

But we must conclude, and our closing words shall be from the translation of a festive song: 'Mind thee of the day when thou shalt start for the land to which one goeth to return not thence. Good for thee will have been a good life; therefore be just and hate iniquity; for he who loveth what is right shall triumph.'[3]

The Bampton Lectures for 1879. The Foundations of Faith considered in Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By HENRY WACE, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London. (London: Pickering and Co., 1880.)

To this work, as a whole, we give a cordial welcome. There are many would-be defenders of religion, in whom zeal is more conspicuous than discretion. Professor Wace is not one of these. He argues almost always guardedly and forcibly. His main object in these Lectures is to enforce the 'distinct and independent claims of the principle of Faith.'[4]

He begins by pointing out how important a factor in the world's development 'faith' has been. Of the influence of faith in moulding the character and the destiny of the Jewish people there can be no dispute, and the author does well to insist upon it. He is on safe ground, too, when he traces the powerful action of this principle in Christendom, and when, taking a still wider survey, and pointing to Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mahometanism, he pronounces that 'faith is at once the great organizing and the great dividing power in the world.'[5]

Passing to the situation of religion at the present moment, the lecturer remarks with some force upon the futility of all efforts to minimize dogma, and divest it of everything mysterious and perplexing. The simplest creed conceivable is the 'belief in the goodness and perfection of God;' but 'the moment the scientific reason begins to discuss it, we are confronted with the tremendous and apparently insoluble problem of the existence of evil.' It is well

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, p. 69.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 69 *seq.*
[3] *Ibid.* p. 71.
[4] *Bampton Lectures for* 1879. Preface.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 7.

Digitized by Google

urged that 'The faith which, in the full sight and consciousness of that problem, maintains its firm assent to the absolute goodness and omnipotence of God, has abandoned the ground of mere rational belief, and has taken a step which justifies, in principle, any subsequent advance.'[1]

The spring of religious belief is found by our author in the 'categorical imperative' of the moral sense—that voice of Conscience which enforces the law of right by the authoritative proclamation of responsibility. He avoids the too common error of apologists who infer that the fundamental tenet of theism is established by the practically universal assent of mankind to its truth. With all deference to the opinions of the late Sir G. C. Lewis and of Mr. Gladstone,[2] we think it an error to suppose that the assent of mankind can be available for establishing any abstract truth. The argument is only too easily parried by the reply that such assent has been often in error. What is established, however, in the present case, is that the religious impulse and the moral sense are normal portions of the human organism.

Mr. Wace bears in mind throughout the fundamental principle that the spring of religion is in the moral sense. In maintaining this view, he is in accord with the best modern philosophy and with the teaching of his most distinguished predecessors in the Bampton Lecture in recent years. Treating of the Apostolic 'witness to revelation,' he says, 'As we saw at the outset, God is essentially the God of the Conscience. In proportion as a message speaks to the Conscience, and is felt to touch its depths, will it be recognized as Divine; and, in proportion as a man shrinks from the intense penetration of that touch will he cease to recognize its Author.'[3]

The remarks in reference to the truthfulness, as a moral quality, of the Apostles, are excellent. For example: 'These men were not pagans . . . and accustomed, like Greeks, to think lightly of a Divine Being, and of communications with Him. They were Jews . . . for whom the very name of God possessed an awful and almost unutterable solemnity. To a Pharisee of the Pharisees like S. Paul, the idea of a communication from God must have been far more overpowering than it is to a modern sceptic.'[4] In this connection the words of an opponent, Professor Kuenen, respecting the prophets, are aptly quoted and applied to the Apostles: 'We see here men who can find no words sufficient to declare the might and majesty of Jahveh, who have a deep and lively sense of their own utter nothingness

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 1879, p. 15.

[2] *Gleanings of Past Years*. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. (1879), vol. iii., pp. 147, 150.

[3] *Bampton Lectures*, 1879, p. 78. Exception may be taken to the phrase 'God is essentially the God of the Conscience:' but the statement that it is emphatically the Conscience by way of which God speaks to us, is unassailable; and preachers are too apt to forget that the *fides quâ creditur* is, before all else, the personal laying hold, by the soul, of the One Personal Good Who is set before it in the *fides quæ creditur*.

[4] *Bampton Lectures*, 1879, p. 73.

Digitized by Google

before Him, and, nevertheless, in spite of the distance which separates them from Him, declare emphatically that they know His counsel and speak His word.'[1]

We cannot dwell upon Mr. Wace's exposition of the Faith of the Old Covenant, valuable as are many of the thoughts suggested. A remark must, however, be made upon the too cursory manner in which he has treated the question of the composition of the Old Testament Scriptures. In the present day an account of the foundations of faith must be regarded as incomplete which does not deal, at least in outline, with this question, more especially when so much is built, as by our author, on the relation of the Holy Scriptures to the individual reason. Yet all he has to say is that 'the general result' of criticism 'is to leave unshaken the chief evidence with which we have to deal;' and, 'it is sufficient, for instance, to read Ewald, in order to be convinced that the substantial truth of the sacred narrative is unassailable.'[2]

The Lecture on the Faith of the Early Church contains much useful suggestion. The shallow charge of a development of theology on the part of the Apostles out of a mere ethical system propounded by Christ is met, as it deserves, with indignant denunciation. Moreover, it is well pointed out that if the Death on the Cross, the Resurrection, and Ascension were real events, 'it is inevitable that there should be a difference, and even a vast difference, between the point of view of those who lived before them and that of those who lived after them; and the distinctive character of the Epistles is thus so far from being a ground of objection, that it is a most conspicuous instance of the harmony of Christian truth.'[3]

We pass now to the Lecture on the Faith of the Church of England, which closes the course. There are many thoughts here of high value, but we find it hard to reconcile some of the views expressed. The Lecture is a statement and defence of the attitude which, in the author's opinion, it is the privilege and the duty of the individual to assume toward all demands upon his spiritual allegiance, and, in particular, toward the demands of the Papacy. It appears to us that in the zeal with which he opposes the latter, he fails to give consistent and clear definition to the rightful claim of the Church at large upon the submission of the individual reason, or, which is another aspect of the same thing, of the light and guidance which that Church supplies to the individual. The success itself with which the Papacy has been able to propagate its outrageous claim ought to teach us that there is a natural want of guidance, and that if, as this want would render probable, guidance has been provided by the Ruler of the world, the neglect of it must be fraught with danger, and, consequently, that any attempt to set forth the foundations of religious belief ought to be very explicit in regard to it. We are convinced that no theory of religion can check the disintegration of Protestantism, and at the same time withstand modern criticism on the one hand, and the pretensions of the Church of

[1] *Bampton Lectures, loc. cit.* [2] *Ibid.* p. 86. [3] *Ibid.* p. 147.

Digitized by Google

Rome, or rather, of the Papacy, on the other, but one which recognizes in the Church of Christ, not a fortuitous combination of individuals who have distilled identical doctrine from Scriptures 'substantially true,' but a Divinely-instituted society, which is, in the fullest sense of the words, the 'pillar and ground of the truth.' We shall not attempt to define the authority which our own Article declares the Church to have 'in controversies of faith,' or to explain the relation between that authority and the individual reason. But we venture to say that this subject might, with advantage, be handled in a future series of the *Bampton Lectures*, and that, if it were well handled, a great want of our day would be met.

On the Origin of the Laws of Nature. By Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Bart., LL.D., Q.C., F.R.A.S., Chancellor and Vicar-General of York. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1879.)

'A GREAT book,' it has been said, 'is a great evil.' Certainly, the goodness of a large book is not always in proportion to its bulk. The same is sometimes true of a small book. Its valuable qualities are not always commensurate with its diminutive size. Sir Edmund Beckett's book mentioned above is a small one, of 107 pages only, and printed in clear, almost bold, type. It would be difficult, however, to find, even among books containing double the quantity of matter on any similar subject, a rival to it in point of excellence.

The arguments are rather scientific than philosophical. No question of phenomenalism is raised. What matter really is is not discussed. The main questions investigated are: Given the ultimate atoms (of whatever kind) that make up matter, how can a world governed by physical laws have come into existence? How can the constancy of those laws be explained? How can living and intelligent beings have been produced, and the generation from like of like, with or without a difference, be conceived possible? Sir Edmund Beckett's book has the merit of bringing vividly before the reader the difficulties that beset the atheistic alternative to the belief in the Creator and Sustainer of the world. He shows that 'materialism means . . . that the universe gradually made itself *proprio vigore*, or by the self-existing power and determination of every atom in the universe to behave as it does' (p. 8). He points out the 'infinite difference between the difficulty (if any) of conceiving one such power' (a Creator, sc.), 'and of conceiving as many as there are atoms in the universe, all having resolved by universal suffrage to act for ever in the various ways they do, and always adhering to that resolution; which means resolving afresh at every moment, and always acting on that resolution' (p. 45).

Instead of making further quotations, we commend the book itself to readers interested in the questions discussed; and if any one feels himself drawn towards Agnosticism or Atheism, we would ask him to read, understand, and refute this little book before he says 'in his heart, There is no God.'

Digitized by Google

A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. Being a Continuation of 'The Dictionary of the Bible.' Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A., Archdeacon of Southwark. Second and concluding volume. (London: John Murray, 1880.)

IT will be a convenience to many subscribers to receive the completion of this useful and valuable work, and it is satisfactory to find that no less care, learning, and judgment has gone to the preparation of it than of the former volume. Now that it is at length complete, the editor and publisher may be congratulated on having produced a work which will be found of substantial service to the student of early Christian antiquities, whatever the special object of his search may be, and on having supplied a requirement in literature which had never, at all events for English readers, been supplied at all adequately before. Bingham's great work needed condensation and arrangement, although it is our experience that it rarely required correction. The endeavours of Cave, Riddle, Dr. Hook, and other well-intentioned and laborious works, were each of them admirable more or less, considered as the achievement of a single man, and probably they have benefited and instructed great numbers of readers. But these good works were far too restricted in plan, and not sufficiently scientific in treatment, to meet the requirements of the student in the present day. It is only by associated effort that any large field of history can be traversed to any good purpose, an expedient which it has been reserved for our own age to practise habitually. These two bulky volumes are a striking instance of the power of 'co-operative' authorship; for it would have been impossible for the most learned and industrious writer to have made the repeated searches throughout the whole range of ancient literature (of the period comprised) which would be needful in order to ascertain the facts of so great a variety of subjects, in anything like the period which these two volumes have taken in preparation, *i.e.* about six years, even if he could have done it at all; while the vast *variety* of subjects which enter into any complete picture of the wide and varied field which the plan of the work comprises—'a complete account,' as the Preface to the first volume states, of the leading personages, the institutions, art, social life, writings, and controversies of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne'—goes to increase the difficulty and the improbability of their being treated satisfactorily by any one mind.

Upon the whole, the various subjects or *tituli*[1] are treated with adequate learning and research, with clearness and completeness, and as a rule, with commendable fairness. The substance of the subject is frequently 'boiled down' somewhat too much, so as to render the articles mere dry statements of fact. The mere historical circumstances are put before the reader, and he is left to group them as he pleases. There is generally an entire absence of 'views,' and this is fortunate, since in some instances, in which we find a

[1] This usage of the word is omitted on p. 1487, vol. ii.

Digitized by Google

very decided view taken, it is one of a disputable kind. Take, for example, the group of articles which deal with the ministry of the Church, and the questions cognate thereto: ORDINAL, ORDINATION, HOLY ORDERS, PRESBYTER OR PRIEST.[1] These are due to the pen of one gentleman who has poured out a flood of learning upon the question, and has come to somewhat remarkable conclusions. It would appear to result from his theories that the Church of the apostolic age had no ministerial organization *for religious purposes* as such. Only the Christian communities which were of *Jewish origin* had presbyters at all. 'Whether the institution of presbyters existed in the first instance outside the limits of the Judæo-Christian communities is doubtful' (p. 1700). And where they did exist, 'the Christian, like the Jewish presbyters, were officers primarily not of worship, but of discipline' (*ibid.*) Bishops, he thinks, were the corresponding officers, in churches of Gentiles, to presbyters in churches of Jews; and as the one presided over Jewish, so the other, 'in the first instance, presided over Gentile communities.' But these had not by any means the same kind of functions as the bishop performed in later times. They were mere financial officers, *stewards* of the property of a particular Church.

'The ἐπίσκοποι of the Greek associations were their officers of finance. Such also were in all probability the ἐπίσκοποι of the early Christian Churches. One of the most important features of those Churches was that they were charitable societies. In an age which, like our own, was marked by great extremes of wealth and poverty, and under circumstances which cut off many of their members from the ordinary pursuits of life, they tended to gather round them more and more every year the poor and the dependent. They dispensed hospitality to travelling brethren, they tended the sick, and, what was probably the weightiest burden, they supported the widows and orphans of those who had died in poverty, or by martyrdom. All this required not only funds, but a dispenser of funds. It was not possible to distribute a common fund satisfactorily by means of a number of officers with equal powers, not necessarily acting in concert. A presiding officer became indispensable, and the officer so appointed was known by the title which was in current use to designate the financial officer of a community. This function of the Christian bishop continued to be a primary one, even after many other functions had clustered round his office. It is not sound to reason from the functions of bishops in the third and fourth centuries to their functions in the first; but, at the same time, the fact that the bishops were the custodians and dispensers of Church funds in the later period corroborates the inference which is drawn from other data, that they were so also in the earlier.'—P. 1702.

Thus the names bishop and presbyter were 'interchangeable,' and afterwards there was a gradual 'fusion of the Judæo-Christian and the Gentile organizations,' and while this was going on, the two offices existed side by side, afterwards becoming permanent.

Still this does not account for the clear and certain fact that the presbyter was subordinate to the bishop from the very earliest times,

[1] We must entirely except from our remarks Mr. A. W. Haddan's learned and orthodox article BISHOP in vol. i.

Digitized by Google

and in every local church of which we can learn anything; and although the writer gets rid of the decisive instance of S. James, by asserting that 'the case of Jerusalem stands on a peculiar footing' (p. 1701), he is fain to allow that 'how the two offices came to co-exist as distinct offices in the same community, is the most difficult point in the whole complex question.' But it is obvious to reply that it is a difficulty entirely self-created, and that the theory first arbitrarily disjoins the two offices, and assigns them to the Jewish and Gentile Churches, and having so done, is utterly unable to explain how, why, or when they should have become united, as they confessedly were, in a single great organization. In short, the theory is condemned by the difficulties itself creates, and falls by its own weight.

Not less arbitrary is another assertion we find in the same article, that the Churches differed in this matter, so that 'in all probability the question does not admit of a single answer, and that the relations of presbyters to bishops varied widely in the several groups into which the Churches of the first two centuries may be arranged,' for which no *sufficient* evidence can be adduced. And curiously enough, the writer does *not* mention the one instance, plausible, if doubtful, which might be quoted on his side, viz., the patriarchate of Alexandria, and its being supplied when vacant out of and by the college of presbyters there. In another part of his article the writer refers to the theory of S. Jerome, revived (though he does not say so) in our own day by Bishop Lightfoot, that 'the Episcopate rose out of the Presbyterate as a safeguard against schism.' Closely connected again with the general question is the nature of Ordination, the power of which forms the one distinction, according to the theory just named, between the bishop and the presbyter. Upon this, as was to be expected, the writer's view is as novel and indicative of his leanings to German writers as that we have already referred to. We cannot here treat it at the length it requires, though we may probably return to the subject hereafter.

Perhaps the most satisfactory articles, as a class, are the purely archæological, which are well written and abundantly illustrated, and in which no supposed necessity for entire impartiality has come in to check the writer's hand, or inspire the editor's scruples. Such are Crucifix, Magi, Miniature, Mosaics. 'Music' contains many curious and little-known facts. 'Marriage' seems to overstep the limits of time assigned to the Dictionary, and in its concluding paragraph treats the subject as connected with the English Church and State very inadequately. We fear we can make no other remark regarding the article 'Ornaments.' It might have been made much better, and from the initials attached to it, we should have looked for a wider and less technical conception and treatment of the subject.

We might continue indefinitely these observations; but *jam satis est.* The work, notwithstanding occasional defects, is a notable and valuable addition, to say the least of it, to English literature; and all concerned in its preparation deserve the general approval which will doubtless be given to them.

Digitized by Google

Prophecy—not 'Forecast,' but (in the words of Bishop Butler) *'the history of events before they come to pass.'* A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, at S. Mary the Virgin's, on the first Sunday in Lent (February 15, 1880), with Introductory Remarks. Being a reply to the Rev. Brownlow Maitland's *Argument from Prophecy*, By JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester. (Oxford and London: J. Parker and Co., 1880.)

THE Rev. Brownlow Maitland published some three years ago, under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, a work entitled *The Argument from Prophecy*, in which he endeavoured to remodel, for present purposes, the accepted argument, *recte et retro*, in favour of revealed religion, drawn from the prophetic impulse and from the record of its results. The effect of his reconstruction of it was to eliminate from *prophecy* expressly almost all the passages which had been considered to be specific predictions, and virtually every one without exception. What was left was merely the record of the blind, if not aimless, workings of the prophetic impulse. The utterances of the Hebrew 'prophets' (for he could still call them by this name) which would still remain to us would consist of vague and undefined aspirations towards a dim and golden future; of utterances which do not in any case descend into particulars, and in which there is nothing distinctly predicted so that it can be recognized again.

It is, however, evident enough how different a phenomenon this would be from the Hebrew prophecies as they have always been held and interpreted by the Church. And though there is a certain argumentative force in the sight of the great *currents* of (we must not say *prophecy* but) aspiration, continuing age after age, and constant to the Messianic ideal, yet, as such an impulse would have been in itself a futile and worthless thing had it remained in its vague and inorganic stage, without ever efflorescing into distinct instances of prediction, as the author of this theory represented, so it could certainly not stand alone as the basis of an apologetic argument.

We have been obliged to be thus lengthy in introducing to our readers the pamphlet before us, since the work to which it refers was issued three years ago, and has presumably passed somewhat out of recollection. It must be conceded that the Dean has been singularly deliberate in his actions to have 'gone off' at last with such an explosion of violent anger as meets the reader in this pamphlet. He has waited for three years, as he says, in the hope 'that some other person would have been found to come forward and do battle for the truth' (p. 17), but that he has been disappointed; a statement which would make us think that the 'learned leisure' of a deanery is far from being so conducive as is generally supposed to the careful study of contemporary literature. Surely Mr. Burgon cannot have quite forgotten the vigorous discussion which this little book received from the Church press at the time of its appearance, nor the small secession from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, consisting of Lord Shaftesbury, and, we think, Canon Miller, and some three

Digitized by Google

or four other clergy, on the ground that it had published this very book. How, then, the Dean can allow himself to speak of the book passing 'any longer unchallenged,' or of its still remaining 'without rebuke,' is exceedingly strange; and he gives himself very needlessly in this preface the airs of a paladin challenging an hitherto triumphant assailant.

It is a pity; for if we take the sermon alone, it is a good and even an admirable one. The preacher sketches with considerable force and beauty the function of the prophetic vision to disclose 'a scheme of Divine Mercy already at work, which subsequent disclosures may render more precise, but cannot possibly enlarge,' and of which 'the horizon has been thrown open at once to the full extent.' Then he goes on to lay down (somewhat strangely) that *the devil* was 'thoroughly versed in Scripture,' was 'possessed in fullest measure of all that was attainable by learning and by assiduous study of the sacred Oracles.' He fancies Satan watching 'the progress of prophetic announcement to mankind, concerning One that was to come, with intense anxiety.' 'He had witnessed the apparent limitation of the promise to the line of Shem—its certain limitation to the posterity of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, of Judah, of David' (p. 23.)

Archimedes required, it is said, an extra-terrestrial *ποῦ στῶ* from whence to ply his lever. Similarly Mr. Burgon has apparently felt the want of an independent spectator of the unfolding of the Divine Drama of Redemption, of some one to act as chorus on the stage and measure the progress of the action. That is not a conception, however, which strikes us as in accordance with Scripture. Rather it seems to be a survival from Dualism, an exaggeration of the fallen archangel into the representative of a fundamental antinomy in the universe of existences. Perhaps we might add that it is symptomatic of a great deficiency in the writer's mind of the faculty of *humour*. But we are upon a grave subject, and we forbear to say more.

Leaving this point, we must note that he has usefully recalled the essential idea of *προφήτης*, which had become somewhat obscured, as being one who speaks *for* God. It would have been well to state in what sense or within what limits this is to be understood, since so broad a generality may cover various theories of inspiration of very different kinds, and until its meaning is thus defined, it is not practically of use in such an inquiry.

In the great body of the sermon we heartily concur. A more nervous and forcible condensation we have never read of the overwhelming proof derivable from the pages of the Scriptures themselves that our Lord and His Apostles held a view of the nature of prophecy very different from that here combated, and specifically that they held many distinct predictions to have been made in the prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament, and, what is more, to have been fulfilled. It was well to restate this evidence, and to do it as uncompromisingly as possible. In doing this the Dean has done a good work for the whole Church. We confess we wish he had done it with greater dignity and equableness of tone.

Digitized by Google

The Modern Pharisee and other Sermons. By JOHN COLE COGHLAN, D.D., late Incumbent of S. Peter's, Vere Street, London. Edited, with Biographical Sketch, by Hercules H. Dickinson, D.D., Dean of the Chapel Royal, Dublin. (London : C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1880.)

THAT can have been no ordinary preacher who attracted the warm admiration of the logical Archbishop Whately, the refined Archbishop Trench, and of an experienced man of the world like the late Lord Carlisle. The doctrine, indeed, of Dr. Coghlan was, we fear, not much higher than that of the first-named of these prelates. But the sermons in the present volume are not doctrinal at all. They have been selected, very judiciously, as specimens of the characteristic qualities of the writer. And these were not doctrinal depth but keen observation of society and sarcastic wit ; effective and not unbecoming weapons for the Christian preacher in assailing the stupid inconsistencies of the world. To our minds these sermons, with their clear anatomy of human motives and their terse felicity, are much more amusing than the generality of modern novels. But we cannot recommend them to any one who thinks that religious reading in order to be good must be also dull. Dean Dickinson tells very graphically the story of a life embittered by miserable domestic calamities, yet saved from cynicism by the friendship of good men. The proceeds of this volume are to be devoted to the education of Dr. Coghlan's sons.

Thoughts on the Seven Last Words of Christ Crucified. By the Rev. FREDERICK CAVAN BLYTH, M.A., Vicar of Quatford, Salop. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1880.)

HERE is a book, judiciously enough compiled from many sources, modern and ancient, Catholic and Acatholic, which is meant to suggest thoughts to preachers for their Lent sermons or meditations, and more especially for the Three Hours' Service on Good Friday. It is available also as a book of private devotion for such as may not be able to attend such services, or to find such services, at church. There is much to commend in the feeling and moderation with which Mr. Blyth has executed his task. Of course points may be found upon which exception might be taken. We wonder what the author's views are of the topography of Jerusalem, when he writes of Mount Calvary that our Lord's 'great type, Isaac, had toiled up this same hill so many hundred years before bearing the wood of the burnt offering.' Is he consciously a disciple of Mr. Fergusson's?

The Armoury of Prayer: A Book of Devotion, compiled by the Rev. BERDMORE COMPTON—(London: Rivingtons, 1880)—has deservedly reached a second edition. It will be valued by all who appreciate a vigorous and manly style of supplication, 'rather sober than ecstatic.' Bishop Andrewes' prayers are largely used in this compilation. It is no discredit to Mr. Compton to say that we prefer Bishop Andrewes, without abridgment, even to this most excellent manual of devotion.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOLUME X.

ACC

ACCIAJOLI, tombs of the, 348
Adamnan, his *Vita S. Columbæ* cited, 56 *sqq.*
Adamson, Mr. R. A., his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant*, 468 *sq.*
Addison, as keeper of Irish Records, 122 *sq.*
Æmilius Paulus on the Pheidian Jove, 120 *sq.*
Æschylus, 103
Aikenhead, Mary Frances, 376 *sq.*
Aikenhead, Dr., 377
Albertoni, Marco, tomb of, 355
Alderson, Baron, on Parish registers, 132
Aleardo Aleardi, review of his life and works, 25–50
Alford, Dean, on *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 360, 363, 364 *sq.*
Alms and Oblations, in the Celtic Church, 74
Andrewes, Bishop, 24
Anglican Orders: Cardinal Newman and Mr. Hutton, 186–229; Canon Estcourt and Mr. Hutton's works, 186 *sqq.*; the Anglican Ordinal, 194 *sq.*, 202 *sqq.*; the Roman Pontifical, 197 *sq.*; S. Liguori on ordinations, 199 *sq.*; the question of the *sacerdotium*, 206 *sq.*; Anglican doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice, 211 *sqq.*; other testimonies, 214 *sq.*; Development, 217 *sq.*; the Canon of the Mass, 219 *sq.*; Episcopal succession, Anglican and Roman, 221 *sqq.*; the Roman system, 225 *sq.*
Anglo-Israelism, review of various theories on the alleged identity of the English people with the Lost Tribes, 319–339

BEN

Anne of Austria, Queen, 145, 147, 149, 159, 167. See Mazarin
Apollos, as the alleged author of *Epistle to Hebrews*, 364 *sq.*
Aragazzi, Bartolommeo, monument of, 350
Arber, Mr., his *Registers of the Stationers' Company*, 135
Arcos, Duke of, 165, 166
Arnold, Professor, 105, 107
Arnolfo del Cambio, 342 *sq.*
Arundel Society, publications of, 340
Articles, the Anglican, and prayers for the dead, 9 *sqq.*
Ashwell, Canon, his *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*. See Wilberforce
Augustine, S., shrine of, 345 *sq.*

BALDUCCIO, 345
Bale, Bp., 125
Balfour, Mr., his defence of philosophic doubt, 451 *sq.*
Bandinelli, Baccio, 357
Barnabas, S., supposed Epistle of, 364
Barrett, Mr. D. W.: *Life and Work among the Navvies*, 534
Beaconsfield, Lord, on the Burials Bill, 515 *sq.*
Beale, Mr. L. S.: *How to Work with the Microscope*, 285
Beatrix d'Este, tomb of, 353
Beaufort, Duke of, 146
Beckett, Sir E.: *Origin of the Laws of Nature*, 546
Benada Abbey, 387
Benavides of Padua, monument of, 357
Benedicite, the ancient Celtic, 63
Benedict XIV. *de sacrosancto Missæ Sacrificio*, 54

Digitized by Google

BEN

Benediction, ancient Celtic, 56 *sq.*
Berger, S., *La Bible au Seizième Siècle*, 537
Blyth, Rev. F. C.: *Thoughts on the Seven Last Words of Christ*, 552
Botticelli, Sandro, 109
Bracelets, sacerdotal, ancient Celtic, 67
Brahmo Somaj, the, 493
Brezé, Admiral de, 149, 167
Brice, Don Gregorio, 168
Brookes, Mr. C. B.: *Popular Guide to the Terms of Art and Science*, 286
Bruni, Lionardo, 350, 351
Buddhism, Bp. Milman on, 501 *sq.*
Bugeaud, Abbé, on the supply of clergy in France, 436 *sq.*
Buonafede, Bp. Lionardo, 356
Burgon, Dean: *Prophecy*, 550
Burials Bill, examination and sketch of the new, 506
Burrows, Rev. H. W., *Lenten and other Sermons*, 287
Busti, Agostino, 354

CAIRD, Prof., on the conception of the moral law, 467; his *Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant*, 468
Cambridge University and Queen Elizabeth's Latin Prayer-book, 14
Campione, Matteo and Bonino di, 346
Can Grande, tomb of, 346
Can Signorio, tomb of, 347
Canon, the ancient Celtic, 61
Canterbury, Convocation of, *Book of Private Prayer* issued by, 263 *sq.*
Cassiodorus, Life and Miscellaneous Letters of, 289–318
Catacombs, art of the, 341 *sq.*
Cavalli, Jacopo, tomb of, 348
Cawnpore, 'well of the massacre,' 492
Celebrant, position and attitude of, in the ancient Celtic Church, 63
Celtic Church, the Liturgy and Ritual of the, 50–84; revived ritual in the Church of England, 50 *sqq.*; character of the Celtic Church, 52; doctrine and ritual practices of, 53 *sqq.*

COL

Chalice, mixed, in the Celtic Church, 76
Chasuble, the ancient Celtic, 64
Cheruel, M., his *Histoire de France pendant la Minorité de Louis XIV.*, and his *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin*, 141 *sqq.* See Mazarin
Chester, Col., his reprint of the registers of Westminster Abbey, 133–134
Chesterfield, Lord, relaxes the penal laws in Ireland, 374
Choral Services of the Celtic Church, 71 *sq.*
Chota Nagpore, Lutheran mission at, 498 *sqq.* See Milman, Bp.
Church of England, The, and Prayers for the departed, 1–25: Dr. Luckock's views on the subject, 1 *sqq.*; Purgatory, 2 *sq.*; Scriptural passages for and against, 4 *sq.*; teaching of the Anglican Church, 5 *sq.*; alterations of the Prayer-Book, *ib.*; Edward VI.'s Articles, 9 *sqq.*; Queen Elizabeth's *Primers*, 11 *sq.*; Latin Service Book, 12 *sq.*; the XXXIX. Articles and the *Homilies*, 14 *sqq.*; revisions of the Prayer-Book, 17 *sq.*; the Communion Service, 19 *sq.*; conclusion, 25; Manuals of Private Devotion, 262 *sq.*; supply of clergy in, 445
Civitale, Matteo, 352
Clement V. and the Templars, 86 *sqq.*
Clergy, the Supply of, in France, 436 *sqq.*; in England, 445
Clifford, Prof., on mathematical truth and causation, 456 *sqq.*
Coghlan, Dr. J. C.: *The Modern Pharisee and other Sermons*, 552
Collects, ancient Celtic, 53 *sq.*
Colleoni, Medea, tomb of, 353
Collier, J., on prayers for the Dead, 15 *sq.*
Colours, sequence of, in ancient Celtic Church, 69 *sq.*; Ecclesiastical and Liturgical, 173–185: in the Church of England, 173 *sq.*, 182 *sq.*; rules of the Sarum Missal, 176; Mr. Rolfe's book, 177 *sqq.*, 185; the Roman sequence, 182; the Lincoln Con-

Digitized by Google

suetudinary, 183; colours at Wells, 184
Columban, S., charges brought against the rule of, 54
Combs, ritualistic, in the Celtic Church, 68
Communion service and prayers for the dead, 19 *sq.*; Hymn, ancient Celtic, 62; in both kinds, in the Celtic Church, 76 *sq.*; women to be veiled at its reception, 78; of infants, 79; reservation of, 79; times of celebration, 80 *sq.*; of the sick, 288
Compton, Rev. Berdmore: *Armoury of Prayer*, 552
Condé, Prince de, 145, 149, 163, 168
Consecration, joint, in the Celtic Church, 73
Convocation of 1661, revision of Prayer-Book by the, 17 *sqq.*
Convocation Prayer-Book, the, 266 *sq.*
Cosin, Bp., on prayers for the dead, 8, 18 *sq.*, 24 *sq.*
Cranmer, Abp., and Edward VI.'s Articles, 9 *sq.*
Cromwell, Lord Chancellor, injunctions concerning parish records, 125, 129
Crowns, Episcopal, ancient Celtic, 68, 69

DAILY ROUND: Meditation, Prayer and Praise, 534
Dalderby, John, Bp. of Lincoln, 89 *sqq.*
Davenant, Bp., on the Mass, 215
Davidson, Dr., on authorship of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 362, 364 *sqq.*
Deaconesses, in Germany, 388 *sq.*; their work, 390 *sqq.*
Dead, Prayers for, ancient Celtic, 58; examination of the subject, 1 *sqq.* See Church of England
Delany, Mrs., and the Poor Clares, 378
Delitzsch, Dr. Franz, on authorship of *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 363 *sqq.*
Desdouits, Th.: *La Métaphysique et ses Rapports avec les autres Sciences*, 536
Döllinger, Dr., on ancient Celtic ritual, 56; on the use of unleavened bread in the Celtic Church, 75
Donatello, monuments by, 350

EALES, Rev. S. J., his *Via Crucis*, 288
Edgecumbe, Sir Piers, 126, 129
Edward II. and the Templars, 88
Edward VI.'s Articles and prayer for the dead, 9 *sq.*
Ely, Bp. of, on Bp. Wilberforce's Ordinations, 250 *sq.*
Emery, Particelli d', 158 *sqq.*
Enghien, Duc d', 145, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 166, 167
England, Church of. See Church of England
England, the Early Christian Church in, 52 *sqq.*
Estcourt, Canon, on Anglican Ordination, 186 *sq.*
Eucharist, sacrificial aspect of ancient Celtic, 52 *sq.*
Eulogia, ancient Celtic, 80
Euripides, 103, 104

FAMILY PRAYERS, 262
Farrar, Dr., on authorship of *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 365; *The Gospel according to S. Luke*, 525
Fliedner, Pastor, 388
France, public Records of, 124; under Louis XIV., 143; party divisions, 145; financial troubles of, 158 *sq.*, 171 *sq.*; the supply of Clergy in, 436 *sqq.*
Fuller, Mr. J. M.: *The Student's Commentary on the Holy Bible*, 528
Fust, Sir H. J., his judgment in *Breeks v. Woolfrey*, 16

GASTON DE FOIX, monument of, 354
Germany, institution of Deaconesses in, 388 *sqq.*
Gladstone, Mr., on materialism, 471
Gondi, Bp., 163, 169
Good Samaritan Sisterhood, 395, 396 *sqq.*
Gossner, Pastor, 388
Goths, the, duelling among, 305, 306
Grammont, Marshal de, 153, 156

Digitized by Google

GRE

Greece. See Hellenism
Guebriant, Marshal, 149, 150
Guise, Duke of, 170 *sq.*
Gustavus Vasa and the Church of Sweden, 260 *sq.*

HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY, the, and the Bp. of Oxford, 256 *sq.*
Harcourt, Marshal d', 158
Harleian Society and Parish records, 134
Haupt, Erich: *The First Epistle of S. John*, 529
Hebrews, Epistle to the, the question of its authorship reviewed, 358–372: opinions of the Fathers and of Reformation divines, 361 *sq.*; the claims of various candidates examined, 362 *sq.*; evidence for S. Paul, 366 *sq.*; ecclesiastical tradition, 367; other evidence, 368 *sqq.*
Hellenism, Debased, and the New Renaissance, comparison of modern and ancient art, 99–121: literary materialism, 100 *sqq.*; Greek art and religion, 102 *sq.*; Æschylus and Euripides, 103 *sq.*; human beauty and modern art-critics, 104 *sq.*; Count Rio, 105 *sqq.*; old and New Hellenism, 106; Hellenic and modern ideas of beauty, 107 *sq.*; scholars of the Italian renaissance, 112; slavery in ancient Greece, 112 *sqq.*; ideals of beauty of modern renaissance, 114 *sq.*; the English school of landscape naturalism, 115; agnostic art, 115, 116; the Attic and modern schools of art, 116; technical instruction, 117; sham art, *ib.*; real value of artistic work, 118; Athenian artists, 118 *sq.*; Roman criticism, 120 *sq.*; art-plunderers, ancient and modern, 121; the false and true in art, *ib.*
Henrietta, Queen of England, 169
Henry VII., Emperor, tomb of, 344
Herbert, Mr. T. M., *The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined*, 471 *sq.*
Heroines of Charity, 372–404:

ITA

Nursing Sisters, 373; Honora Nagle, 373 *sqq.*; Mary Frances Aikenhead, 376 *sq.*; Countess Stolberg, 388 *sqq.*; Dorothy Pattison, 395 *sq.*
Hine, Mr., his views on Anglo-Israèlism, 332
Hobhouse, Sir Arthur, his epitaph on Bishop Milman, 489
Homilies, the, and prayers for the dead, 14 *sqq.*
Hook, Dr., and Bp. Wilberforce, 237 *sq.*
Horne, on authorship of *Epistle to Hebrews*, 366 *sq.*
Houdancourt, Marshal la Mothe, 158
Houghton, Lord, on Bp. Wilberforce, 231
Huguenots, the, under Louis XIV., 148 *sq.*
Hutton, Mr., on Anglican Orders, 186 *sqq.*
Huxley, Prof., on causation, 464 *sqq.*

ILARIA DEL CARRETTO, tomb of, 349
Incense, in the Celtic Church, 72
India, Bp. Milman on the evangelization of, 492 *sqq.*; on missionary bishops in, 502
Innocent X., Pope, 164 *sq.*
Intermediate State, the, 2 *sqq.* See Church of England
Ireland, alleged arrival of Israelites in, 334; Jacob's stone in, 336; Sisters of Charity in, 373 *sqq.*; operation of the penal laws, 374 *sqq.*; Order of Poor Clares in, 378; the cholera of 1832, 382
Italian Renaissance, sepulchral monuments of the, 339–357: Greek and Christian monuments, 340 *sq.*; Niccola Pisano, 342 *sq.*; Arnolfo and Giovanni Pisano, 342, 343; monuments of Pisa, *ib.*; shrine of S. Augustine, 345 *sq.*: tomb of Can Grande, 346; tombs of Venice, 347 *sq.*, 355; Della Quercia, 349; fifteenth-century art, *ib.*; Ghiberti and Donatello, 349 *sq.*; Tuscan tombs, 351, 356; Sigismund Malatesta, Bartolommeo and

Digitized by Google

JAC

Medea Colleoni, 353; Agostino Busti, 354; sixteenth-century sculptures, 355 *sq.*

JACOB, Rev. E., on the last moments of Bp. Milman, 503 *sq.*
James, Cardinal, monument to, 352
Jessopp, Dr., on Parish Records, 131, 137, 138
Jewel, Bp., 14, 15
Jones, Mr. Burne, his works, 104, 105, 115

KANT, EMMANUEL, and his philosophical system, 462 *sqq.*
Kingston, Duchess of, her marriage register, 132

LAND tenure, the system of, in ancient Palestine, 404–435
Lange, Professor, on the Materialistic theory, 470 *sq.*
Langmead, Mr. T., on parish registers, 137
Lections, ancient Celtic, 55 *sq.*
Lee, Dr. F. G., *On the Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed*, 1 *sqq.* See Church of England
Lerida, second siege of, 168
Liguori, S. Alphonso, on ordinations, 199
Liturgy, Celtic and Gallican, 60; accessories of the, in the Celtic Church, 82 *sq.*
London, plague of, 135
Lonsdale, Miss, her biography of Sister Dora Pattison, 396 *sqq.*
Louis XIII., 144
Louis XIV. See Mazarin.
Lucca, tomb of Ilaria at, 349
Luckock, Dr. H. M., his *After Death*, 1 *sqq.*, 20. See Church of England
Lynch, Miss Cecilia, 377 *sqq.*

MAC COLL, Rev. M., *The Ober-Ammergau Passion-Play*, 287
Maclean, Sir John, on parish registers, 137
Mackey, Rev. D. J., *Diocesan Map of England and Wales*, 287
Mâcon, synod of, 53, 54
Madron, Mr. Millett's registers of, 133, 135, 136

MIL

Magnusson, Dr. Petrus, 260 *sq.*
Maniple, the ancient Celtic, 64
Martensen, Bishop, on the intermediate state, 2
Masaniello, revolt of, 169 *sq.*
Mass, in the Celtic Church, 80 *sqq.*
Massegne, Paolo delle, 348
Mastino, monument of, 346
Materialism, philosophic, 469 *sq.*
Mazarin and the Minority of Louis XIV., 141–172: hostile accounts of the Cardinal, 142; difficulties of his administration, 142, 145, 147; state of France, 143; the Thirty Years' war and the treaty of Münster, 143 *sq.*; sketch of the first five years of Louis XIV.'s reign, 144 *sqq.*; Mazarin confirmed as Prime Minister, 145; arrest of the Duke of Beaufort, 146; the Queen's prodigality, 147; the Huguenots, 148; Turenne, *ib.*; campaigns on the Rhine, 149 *sq.*, 152, 153, 168; his foreign policy, 151 *sq.*, 162; campaign of the Palatinate, 154 *sqq.*, 156; war with Spain, 158; financial troubles, 158 *sq.*, 171; intrigues against him, 162 *sq.*; his Italian policy, 164 *sq.*; campaign in Italy, 165, 168; his Dutch policy, 169; military, financial and diplomatic failures, 170 *sq.*
Mazarin, Michel, 165, 166
McLeod, Dr. Norman, on Bishop Milman's social gatherings in Calcutta, 483
Mercy, General, 150, 153, 156
Michelangelo, 356
Mill, Mr. J. S., 456; Bp. Milman on, 491
Millett, Mr., his *Registers of Madron*, 133, 135, 136
Milman, Bp., review of Life of by his Sister, 478–505: his early career and training, 479 *sq.*; his idea of missionary work, 482 *sq.*; social gatherings and discussions with educated natives, 483 *sq.*; his addresses, 484 *sq.*; lecture in Hindustani, 485; on the lack of missionaries, 486; his pastoral journeys and labours, 487 *sq.*; his epitaph, 489; his criticisms,

Digitized by Google

MIL

490 *sq.*; other writings 492 *sq.*; his tolerance, 495 *sq.*; difficulties of his position, 496; lay helpers and ritual, 497 *sq.*; Lutheran Mission at Chota Nagpore, 498 *sq.*; visits to Burmah, 501 *sq.*; missionary bishops for India, 502; closing scenes of his life, 503 *sq.*

Milton, J., absence of record in parish registers concerning his wives, 140

Milton, Rev. W.: *Mr. Parker's Fallacies Refuted.* Letter on the Advertisements and Ornaments Rubric, 273

Mino da Fiesole, 351

Modern Philosophy and the Supernatural in Nature, 447–478: possibility of philosophy, 449 *sq.*; philosophic doubt, 451 *sq.*; Prof. Clifford and Mr. Mill, 455 *sqq.*; Kant and his system, 462 *sqq.*

Mosaic law of land tenure, 406 *sqq.*

Moule, Rev. H. C. C., his edition of *Epistle to the Romans*, 276 *sq.*

Mount-Edgcumbe, Lord, and the Burials Bill, 507

Moylan, Dr., R. C. Bp. of Cork, 377

Mozley, Prof., on the beautiful, 109

Mummius, Consul, and Greek art, 121

Münster, Congress of, 143, 151, 155, 157, 164, 171

Murray, Dr., R. C. Abp. of Dublin, 378 *sq.*, 382 *sq.*, 386

NAGLE, Honora, 373 *sqq.*

Napoleon I. on Condé, 157

Nelson, Admiral, 150, 151

Newman, Cardinal, on Anglican Orders, 186 *sqq.*; Mr. J. H. and Bp. Wilberforce, 232 *sqq.*

Nicholson, Bp., on Border registers, 133

Nicholson, Dr. A., *Apostolical Succession in the Church of Sweden*, 259 *sq.*

Nicholson, Mr. E. B., his *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, 278 *sq.*

O'FERRALL, Dr. Joseph, 381

Old Testament, with Commentary, 528

PEC

Oliphant, Mrs., her *Beleaguered City*, 283 *sq.*

Ommanney, Mr. G. D. W., *The Early History of the Athanasian Creed*, 523

Organs, in the Celtic Church, 71, 72

Orleans, Duke of, 152, 153, 163 *sq.*, 166 *sq.*

Owen, Rev. R. O., his *Sanctorale Catholicum*, 269

Oxenham, Mr. H. N., *Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in* 1871, 287

PALESTINE, The System of Land Tenure in Ancient, 404–435

Paris, riots in, 159 *sq.*; the Parliament of, 159, 172

Parish Registers, the Past and Future of, 122–141: former neglect of our national records, 122 *sq.*; public and private manuscripts, 123; value of parish records, 124 *sq.*, 132; monastic registers, 125; Government injunctions concerning, 125, 126, 127; Parish Register Bill of 1812, 128; Select Committee upon, 128, 129; destruction of early records, 129, 130, 131; falsification of, 132; registers of Westminster Abbey, 133 *sq.*; the Harleian Society, 134, 135; S. Peter's, Cornhill, 134, 135; Mr. Millett's *Registers of Madron*, 135, 136; local registers of England, 136 *sqq.*; proposals for better preservation of, 137 *sqq.*; facts still to seek, 140 *sq.*

Parker, Mr., his *Letter to Lord Selborne* cited, 13; his *Introduction* cited, 17 *sqq.*

Parker, Abp., 143; his edition of Ælfric's Homily, 210

Parthenon, sculptures of the, 103

Pastoral Staff, the ancient Celtic, 65

Pater, Mr. H. A., his studies of the Renaissance, 100 *sq.*

Pattison, Sister Dora, 395 *sq.*; her work at Walsall, 398 *sqq.*

Paul, S., 111, 112; evidence for his authorship of *Epistle to Hebrews*, 366 *sq.*

Pax, the ancient Celtic, 57 *sq.*

Pectoral Crosses, ancient Celtic, 65

Digitized by Google

PER

Perowne, Dr. J. J. S., his *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 276 *sq.*, 525
Peter's, S., Cornhill, registers of, 134, 135
Peterborough, Bp. of, on the Burials Bill, 513 *sq.*
'Petit-maître,' origin of the name, 166
Pheidias, and his critics, 119 *sq.* See Hellenism
Philip the Fair and the Templars, 86 *sq.*
Phillpotts, Bp., pastoral of, 243 *sq.*
Pietro Martire, S., monument of, 345
Pisano, Niccola and Giovanni, 342 *sq.*
Pius VII. and the British Government, 379
Pliny cited, 120
Polybius cited, 129
Prayer-Book, first Anglican and prayers for the dead, 5 *sqq.*; successive alterations in, 7 *sqq.*; the Latin version of 1560, 12 *sq.*
Prayers for the dead, ancient Celtic, 58 *sq.*
Prefaces Proper, ancient Celtic, 56
Private Prayer, the Book of, 262
Purgatory, the doctrine of, 2 *sqq.* See Church of England

QUERCIA, Della, 349

RANTZAU, Fräulein von, 389 *sq.*
Red Cross, Knights of the, 390, 392
Renaissance, the New. See Hellenism
Renouf, P. Le Page: *The Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, 539
Retz, Cardinal de, 163 *sq.*
Reynolds, Rev. J. W.: *The Supernatural in Nature*, 477
Ring, episcopal, antiquity of the, 64
Rio, Count, on Greek art, 105, 106
Ritual, Liturgical, in the Church of England, 50 *sqq.*
Rock, Dr., on ancient Celtic ritual, 57, 67; on chasubles, 184 *sq.*
Rolfe, Mr. C. C., his *Ancient Use of Liturgical Colours*, 173 *sqq.*
Romilly, Lord, his report on the public records, 123

SWI

Rose, Sir G., his Parish Register Bill, 128
Rossellino, Antonio, 352
Rossetti, Miss, on beauty, 104
Rossetti, Mr. D. G. 104, 115
Rovezzano, Benedetto da, 356
Ruelens, Mr. C., his *Facsimile of the De Imitatione Christi*, 270 *sq.*
Ruskin, Professor, 109

SALES, S. Francis de, anecdote of, 384
Salutati, tomb of Bishop, 351
Sancroft, Bishop, 18, 20, 21
Savoy Conference and prayers for the dead, 8
Savoy, Prince Thomas of, 165 *sq.*, 170
Schomberg, Marshal, 160
Selborne, Lord, his *Liturgical History*, &c., cited, 18. See Church of England. Burials Bill
Sellon, Miss, 394
Sepulchral Monuments of the Italian Renaissance. See Italian Renaissance
Settignano, Desiderio di, 351
Simpson, M. S.: *Steps through the Stream, or Daily Readings for a Month*, 531
Sismondi on Philip the Fair, 86
Sisterhoods, Anglican, 394 *sq.*
Smith, Dr. W., and Wace, Rev. H.: *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 272 *sq.*
Smith, Dr. W., and Cheetham, Archdeacon S.: *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 547
Socrates, the secret of his power, 110, 111, 112
Sophocles, his religious system, 106
Sparrow, Bishop, cited, 8
Stephen, Mr. Leslie, on philosophy and history, 448
Stolberg, Count Anton, 388; his family, 388 *sqq.*
Stolberg, Count Friedrich, 388
Stolberg, Countess Anna zu, 388 *sqq.*
Stolberg, Count Eberhard, 390 *sqq.*
Supernatural, The, in Nature, 471 *sq.*, 475 *sq.*
Sweden, Apostolic succession in the Church of, 259 *sq.*
Swinburne, Mr., tendency of his poetry, 105; his address to Mdlle. Bernhardt, *ib.*

Digitized by Google

SYM

Symonds, Mr. J. A., on Greek poetry, 100 *sq.*

TADEMA, Mr. Alma, 114, 115
Talon, Omer, 143, 145, 172
Tarlati, Guido, tomb of, 344
Templars, suppression of the, in England, 84–99: rise and growth of the Order, 85 *sq.*; persecution of the, in France, 87; their treatment in England, 88 *sqq.*; their trial and sentence, 90 *sqq.*
Theodoric the Goth, his government of Italy, 289 *sqq.* See Cassiodorus
Thompson, Mr. S., his photographs of Italian monuments, 340 *sqq.*
Thring, Rev. G., his *Church of England Hymn Book*, 267
Tiele, Dr. C. P.: *Outlines of the History of Religion*, 530
Tino da Camaino, 344
Titcomb, Bishop, his Anglo-Israelite theories, 325 *sqq.*; on the Saxons in India, 335
Tondini de Quarenghi, Rev. C., his *Primacy of S. Peter*, 518 *sqq.*
Tregelles, Dr. S. P., on the Pauline authorship of *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 367
Turenne, Marshal, 148 *sq.*, 150, 153 *sq.*, 156, 168

UNLEAVENED bread, use of, in the Celtic Church, 75
Ursulines, The, in Cork, 375 *sqq.*

VENICE, tombs of, 347
Ventura, Giovanni and Agnolo di, 345
Vestments, ancient Celtic, 63 *sq.*
Vincent de Paul, S., Sisterhoods of, 373

ZEL

WACE, H.: *The Bampton Lectures for* 1879, 543
Wallon, M. H., his *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*, 280 *sq.*
Walsall, Anglican Sisters at, 399 *sq.*
Werth, Jean de, 156, 157
Wilberforce, Bp., review of the first volume of his *Life*, 229–259: leaders of the English Church revival, 230, 234, 236 *sq.*; Canon Ashwell's work, 230 *sqq.*; articles in the *Quarterly* and *Fortnightly Review*, 231; Bp. Wilberforce in relation to the Tractarian movement, 232 *sqq.*; on Church parties, 237; the Bishop as a High Church leader, 238 *sq.*, 251; the Papal aggression, 242; Episcopal address and Bishop Phillpotts' Charge, 242 *sq.*; Bp. Wilberforce's oratory, 245 *sq.*; on Ritual, 253; the Hampden controversy, 256 *sq.*; his apology (now first printed) for revoking his Letters of Request against Dr. Hampden, 257
Winchelsea, Abp. Robert, letters concerning the Templars, 93 *sq.*
Winter, Rev. R., on Bp. Milman, 485
Wolsey, Cardinal, vicissitudes of his tomb, 356
Wordsworth, Bp., on *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 360, 363; *S. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome in the Third Century*, 522 *sqq.*

YORK, Abp. of, and the Burials Bill, 507

ZELLER, Prof., his *Socrates and the Socratic Age*, 102, 103, 106

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google